31—3

Presented by
John Hall

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Princeton, N. J.

From the PUBLISHER.

Case, Division.....
Shelf, Section.....
Book, No.....

SCC
1313

51—3

Presented to the Gree
Library by John Wray
J. J.
May 1841

THE

CHURCH

OF

ENGLAND

Defended againſt the

Calumnies *and Falſe* Reaſonings,

OF THE

CHURCH

OF

ROME.

In ANSWER to a late Sophiſtical, and Inſolent, Popiſh Book; *Entitled*, ENGLAND's *Converſion and Reformation compar'd*, &c.

By JOSEPH TRAPP, M. A. Miniſter of the United Pariſhes of *Chriſt-Church*, and St. *Leonard*'s Foſter-Lane, *London*.

At which Boldneſs of Theirs we ſhould much wonder; but that we conſider that Bankrupts commonly do then moſt brag of their Ability, when their Eſtate is at the loweſt: Perhaps alſo that *Ignorance* might be it, which did beget in them this *Boldneſs*. Bp. *Uſher*'s Anſwer to the Jeſuite's Challenge. P. 31.

London: Printed for *J. Smith*, at *Inigo Jones*'s Head over-againſt *Exeter-Exchange* in the *Strand*, *W. Mears* at the *Lamb* without *Temple-Bar*, and *J. Batley* at the *Dove* in *Paternoſter-Row*, 1727.

TO THE

KING.

SIR,

THIS Book, written to vindicate That Faith and Religion of which Your Majesty is Defender, That Church of which under God You are Head and Protector, happening to

to see the Light at the Time of Your auspicious Accession to the Throne of these Kingdoms; it was natural for its Author humbly to implore the Favour and Honour of laying It, and Himself, at Your MAJESTY's Feet.

Especially, considering that it is not only pointed against the Doctrines, and Practices of Those, some of whom at least would exempt a great and very considerable Part of the Christian World, the Clergy, from all Subjection to Sovereign Princes; but is particularly a Defence of Your MAJESTY's Supremacy in Ecclesiastical Affairs, as declar'd by the Laws of This Realm, and made an Essential

ſential Part of the Conſtitution of our Government. Notwithſtanding which, it is openly deny'd and rejected by Thoſe againſt whom I write; who would wreſt from Your MAJESTY This valuable Branch of Your Prerogative, one of the brighteſt Jewels in That Imperial Crown to which You happily ſucceed.

That it may long flouriſh upon your Head, in Peace, and Glory, for the Comfort and Benefit of This Church and Nation, and for the Maintenance and Encouragement of true Religion and Virtue; That God would pour all his Bleſſings in This World and the Next, upon Your ſacred MAJESTY, Your

Royal

DEDICATION.

Royal Conſort our Gracious Queen, and all Your Royal Iſſue, is the ſincere and hearty Prayer of,

May it pleaſe Your MAJESTY,

Your MAJESTY'S *moſt Loyal,*

and Dutiful,

Subject, and Servant,

JOSEPH TRAPP

THE

PREFACE.

IT has happen'd, as it uſually does in Theſe Caſes: I promis'd Strictures upon a Book; and have been inſenſibly drawn in to give it a compleat Anſwer. For I pretend (to uſe our Author's Word) that This is ſuch: There is not the Shadow of an Argument in his boaſted Performance, which I have not fully conſider'd; and, I think at leaſt, confuted.

Boaſted, I ſay: For beſides the Brags which he himſelf makes of his ſtrong Reaſonings in ſeveral Parts of his Dialogue; the Party, I hear, has pronounc'd it abſolutely unanſwer-

able.

able. *When, in truth, all the Matters of* Fact *it contains are either* impertinent, *or* falſe; *And in point of* Argumentation, *it is little more than a perpetual String of* Sophiſms, *or* Fallacies. *All falſe Reaſonings are* fallacious *in a wide Senſe: But moſt of His are ſtrictly* Fallacies, *as they are mark'd out in the common Books of Logick. I have ventur'd to be guilty of ſo much* Pedantry, *as to call two or three of them by their* Scholaſtick *Names: Which, I flatter my ſelf, will be the more eaſily excuſed; in conſideration that our Author tempted me to it, by his dealing ſo much in* Syllogiſms, *and* Dilemmas.

I take it for granted, becauſe it is an objection always in the Mouths of Thoſe who have nothing elſe to ſay, that I ſhall be accus'd by Him, and his Friends, of treating him with too little Ceremony. I acknowledge I have treated him with Freedom; but not with ill Manners. The

roughest

roughest Words I have us'd were not made a Part of Language for nothing: And I appeal to the World, whether I have not apply'd them properly, *not transgressing the Rules of* Decency, Civility, *or* true *Christian* Charity. *I know not who my* Anonymous *Antagonist is; and therefore may be allow'd to write, as if I wrote against no* particular Person, *but against* Popery, Sophistry, *and* Insolence. *For his Behaviour to the Church, and Clergy of* England, *is beyond measure insolent, and abusive. Which, even if He had set his Name to his Book, would have justify'd much more Asperity than I have shewn towards him.*

What I have any where said of This Kind, I desire may be apply'd, as it was intended to be, not to the Roman Catholicks (*as they are call'd*) *in general; but only to the Factors or Agents for Popery, the Priests, and Missionaries. There are doubtless*

leſs many worthy Gentlemen among us; ſo unfortunate as to be bred up in That corrupt Religion. Againſt the Behaviour *of Theſe I object nothing: I honour their Perſons; pity their Errors; and heartily pray for their Converſion, and the Salvation of their Souls. So indeed I do for the Converſion and Salvation of their miſſionary Prieſts Themſelves: But then Theſe Laſt have not a Right to the ſame Treatment with Thoſe Others. Beſides the Reaſon already given, They are* ravening Wolves, *watching all Opportunities to devour our Flocks; and therefore muſt pardon us if we call them by their* true Names, *and* cry aloud *to our Flocks, when the Wolf is coming.*

Eſpecially if the Wolf, as upon Theſe occaſions, He generally does, comes in Sheep's Cloathing. *I have therefore detected the* cunning Craftineſs *of my Adverſary's godly Talk, againſt Prejudice, Self-Intereſt, and*

Love

Love of the World. These are Baits *to deceive the* Unlearned ; *who do not consider, or it may be do not know, that no Falshood can insinuate itself, without the Mixture of some, tho' very impertinent, Truth : And in Religious matters, none will be swallow'd by Persons Religiously dispos'd, unless it be gilded with the Appearance of Sanctity.*

Whenever I speak contemptuously, *as I sometimes do, because the best* Reason *I have tells me it is in such Cases* fit *to do so ; I desire to be understood not of my Adversary's* Person, *but of his* Arguments. *For besides that in general, I despise not the Person of the Meanest upon Earth ; He in particular may be a Man of Learning, and Abilities, for any thing I know. Nay, I think in this very Performance he has shewn that he is : And so were* Bellarmine, *and* Suarez *before him. But the* Cause *is so indefensible ; that it makes the greatest*

greateſt Men talk ridiculouſly. The beſt we can ſay of their Reaſonings is, that they are learned Abſurdities : *And That is but ſlender Praiſe. There may be much* Learning *in them; but there's no* Common Senſe.

If I have miſapprehended any Facts, *as I believe I have Not ; they are ſuch, as, whether true, or falſe, no way affect the Merits of the* Cauſe. *For in all material ones I am certain I have made no material Miſtake. Should the* Romaniſts *therefore be able, as I am well aſſur'd they will not, to convict me of an Hiſtorical Error, relating, for inſtance, to* Auſtin, *or* Dinoth, Cranmer, *or the Queen of* Scots, *in which the Popiſh, and Proteſtant Religion are not concern'd ; They will have no manner of Reaſon to triumph in That, or ſuch like Trifles : A Weakneſs to which Thoſe are always extremely prone, who have* Nothing *to* triumph in, *That is* ſolid, *or* ſubſtantial.

THE

THE

CONTENTS.

To the First Dialogue, *Entitled*, The General Grounds of the Catholick Faith: *Sect. I. Entitled*, The Obligation of submitting our private Judgment does not exclude Examination. *Page* 2

To the Second Section; *Entitled*, Faith is not against Reason. *p.* 15

To the Third Section; *Entitled*, Faith depends in a different manner on the Testimony of God, and on the Testimony of Men. *p.* 47

To the Fourth Section; *Entitled*, The Church of Christ consider'd as Infallible. *p.* 53

To

To the Fifth Section ; Entitled, The Church's, perpetual Indefectibility, and Infallibility, prov'd from the ninth Article of the Creed. *p.* 84

To the Sixth Section: The Rule of Faith. *p.* 109

To the Seventh Section: Of Scriptures, and Church-Authority. *p.* 145

To the Eighth Section ; Entitled, A Recapitulation of the foregoing Sections. *p.* 168

To the SECOND DIALOGUE ; *Entitled,* Containing a brief Historical Account of the Conversion of the *Britons* and *Saxons* ; with Proofs of their Agreement in Faith ; and some Remarks upon Circumstances relating to the Conversion of the *Saxons.* *p.* 171

To the First Section ; Entitled, The Importance of Enquiring into *the Marks* of the *true Church ;* in which alone Salvation is prov'd to be possible. *p.* 173

To

To the Second Section; *Entitled*, Neither Education, nor Intereſt are to be conſulted, in the Choice of our Religion. *p.* 179

To the Third Section: Of the firſt Entrance of Chriſtianity into *Britain*; it's Progreſs and Eſtabliſhment there, in the Reign of King *Lucius*. *p.* 188

To the Fourth Section: Of the Converſion of the *Engliſh Saxons* from Paganiſm to Chriſtianity. *p.* 193

To the Fifth Section; *Entitled*, A Relation of St. *Auguſtin*'s Conference with the *Britiſh* Biſhops. *p.* 196

To the Sixth Section; *Entitled*, St. *Auguſtin* Vindicated. *p.* 197

To the Seventh Section; *Entitled* Roman Catholicks profeſs to this Day the Faith which St. *Auguſtin* preach'd. *p.* 203

To the Eighth Section; *Entitled*, The ſame Faith, was preach'd to the *Saxons*, as had been preach'd four hundred Years before to the *Britons*. *p.* 252

To

To the Ninth Section; Entitled, The ſame Subject continued. *p.* 265

To the Tenth Section; Entitled, Some Obſervations upon the Converſion of *England* under Pope *Gregory.* *p.* 276

To the THIRD DIALOGUE, *and The* PREFACE. *p.* 281

The Method of Anſwering, Section by Section, departed from, and Why. *p.* 282

To the Objection; That the *Agents* in our *Reformation* were Perſons of *wicked and Scandalous Lives.* *p.* 283

Of K. *Henry VIII.* *p.* 284

Of Archbiſhop *Cranmer.* *p.* 285

Of the Duke of *Somerſet*, &c. *in* K. Edward *VI*'s. *Reign.* *p.* 289, 290, 291.

Of Queen *Elizabeth.* ibid.

Our

Our Author's misrepresenting some Facts, *and his* false Reasonings *from* others, *consider'd.* *From p.* 292, *to p.* 309

The Sum of the Whole under This Head. *p.* 309

To the Objection; that The *Reformation* was begun, and carried on, by *unlawful Means*, and an *incompetent Authority*; by *Force*, and *Violence*; and the *Encroachments* of the *Civil State*, invading the Spiritual Rights of the *Church*, *and Clergy.* *p.* 310, &c.

The King's Supremacy. *p.* 320, &c.

The Sum of the whole under This Head. *p.* 376

To the FOURTH DIALOGUE; *Entitled*, Containing a Comparison between the most remarkable Circumstances of *England*'s Conversion on the one hand, and its pretended Reformation on the other. *p.* 379

To the first, Second, and Third Sections. *p.* 381

To the Fourth Section; *Entitled*, The *Unity* of Faith on the one ſide compar'd with the *Diſagreements* on the other. *p.* 392

To the Fifth and laſt Section; *Entitled*, The general *external Marks* of the *true Church* on the one ſide, compar'd with the *entire want* of them on the other. *p.* 411

AN

ANSWER

TO A

Popish BOOK,

ENTITLED,

ENGLAND's *Conversion and Reformation compar'd*, &c.

OUR Author's *Preface* (setting aside the Account of his *Design* and *Method*, which we have nothing to do with) being no more than a Supplement to his *Third Dialogue*; I shall postpone my Reflections upon it, 'till we *come to the Examination of That Dialogue*; in Conjunction with which, it shall be fully and particularly consider'd.

To the First Dialogue, Sect. 1.

THIS First Dialogue (if we may believe the Title of it) contains *the general Grounds of the Catholick Faith.* All which, after much division and subdivision, explaining and distinguishing, saying and unsaying, giving with one hand, and taking away with the other, are resolv'd at last into This single Principle, " That the Church of *Rome* is to " be implicitly believed, whatever she says. That I do not misrepresent the Matter, and that This, and nothing else, is the Result of *Eight* different *Sections* (whatever *Titles* they bear) must be very plain, to any Reader of no extraordinary Sagacity. This first Section, I confess, seems to promise the contrary: Because in the Front it carries these Words, as the *Contents*, or *Summary* of it; *The Obligation of submitting our private Judgment does not exclude Examination.* In the Discourse itself, the *young Gentleman* and his *Preceptor* talk of * *searching diligently into the very bottom of the Cause*; and the Former is *charm'd to hear* the Latter say, He may and ought to do so. But then we are told at the same time, That *we ought to captivate our Understanding unto the Obedience of Faith, and pay an entire Submission*

* *Pag.* 1, 2.

to

to the Deciſions of the Catholick Church. Pray obſerve how prettily they are coupled; as if *Captivating our Underſtanding to the Obedience of Faith, and paying an entire Submiſſion to the Deciſions of the Catholick Church*, were all one. And, indeed, to confound theſe Two with each other, is the principal Deſign of his whole Book. Yet we are charg'd with *wronging* the Church of *Rome*, for ſaying that her Members *are kept in the Dark* * *by their politick Guides, and bid to ſhut their Eyes againſt the Light of Reaſon; leſt it ſhould diſcover to them the Follies, and Errors of their Religion.* Why, *does not* That Church require an *abſolute, implicit* Submiſſion to all her Dictates, be they *what they will?* Is it not the main Drift of This very Author's Performance, to *prove* that ſuch a Submiſſion is *due?* And is not This keeping us in the Dark? No, ſays the Gentleman, *Submiſſion doesnot exclude Examination*; becauſe we are at liberty to *examine* whether ſuch a Submiſſion be *due* to the Church, or not. Be it ſo then: If it ſhall appear that ſuch a Submiſſion is *not* due; and if yet the Church of *Rome* requires it, as All agree ſhe *does*; it muſt be granted, that ſhe *keeps People in the Dark, and bids them ſhut their Eyes againſt the Light of Reaſon.* That *ſuch a Submiſſion then is* due,

* *Pag.* 2.

This Author affirms, and I abſolutely deny. To ſhew that *Submitting and Examining may be join'd together* (and that they may I readily grant, in one Senſe, though not in His) he very formally and mathematically lays down four Principles. I do not tranſcribe them; becauſe (as he truly ſays) they are *agreed to without Contradiction, by Proteſtants as well as Catholicks*: except only one Expreſſion in the ſecond of them, [*never ſo ſeemingly contrary to Reaſon*] of which more hereafter.

But I cannot imagine what Uſe he makes of them; ſince they prove nothing, but what no Chriſtian denies. The thing to be made out is, not that an implicit Submiſſion is due to *reveal'd Truths*; but that it is due to the *Church*. In reference to theſe reveal'd Truths, the *Trinity*, &c. *Reaſon* (* ſays he) *can have no other Part to act, than that of an entire Submiſſion*. Well, we grant it: Meaning, after the Perſon is ſatisfy'd that they are revealed. But what are the next Words? *Whenever the Revelation of them is declared to us* (pray mind it) *by that Authority which Chriſt has appointed to be our Guide*: And That *Guide* is the *Church*; and That *Church* is the *Church* of *Rome*. Here we have the whole Myſtery of the Matter. This is the grand Point he drives at from the firſt Page

* P

to

to the laſt. As we ſhall meet with it very often in the Progreſs of This Controverſy, and the ſeveral Parts of it ſhall hereafter be diſtinctly conſider'd, I at preſent only deſire the Reader to take Notice, that there is a wide difference between a *Revelation*, and the *Senſe* of a *Thing reveal'd*; between *Declaring* that a Point is *reveal'd*, and *Interpreting* the *Senſe* of it; between *modeſtly* and *ſoberly* Interpreting a *difficult* Point, and *arbitrarily* and *inſolently* Interpreting a *plain* one, contrary to common Reaſon; between *Interpreting* the *old*, *true* Word of God, and *making a new*, *falſe* Word of God; between *Teſtimony*, and *Authority*; or, if you pleaſe, between the *Authority of Teſtimony*, and *Authority in general*, or any *other Species* of *Authority* in particular; between a *Guide*, and a *Witneſs*; between the Church *Univerſal*, and the Church of *Rome*, or (in other Words) between the *Whole*, and a *Part*. Let the Reader (I ſay) take This *Clue* of *plain Diſtinctions* at his firſt *ſetting out*; for we ſhall *perpetually* make *Uſe* of it, in the *Labyrinth* through which we are to travel.

For ſurely (continues he *) *whoever gives his interior Aſſent to any thing above his Underſtanding, is properly ſaid to ſubmit his*

* *Ibid.*

Judgment to it. Queſtionleſs. *And this is ALL the Submiſſion we require of the Members of our Church.* That I totally deny. You require Submiſſion not only to Things *above* our Underſtanding; but to Things *contrary* to our Underſtanding, and our Senſes; not only to Things *reveal'd by God*, but to Things which he has *not* reveal'd, nay, which are *contrary* to Thoſe which he *has* reveal'd. So that we need not turn *Atheiſts*, *and Deiſts*; † and may yet refuſe to turn *Papiſts.*

We do not ſay (as he affirms we do ‡) that the *Doctrine of Submiſſion is but in Effect a ſofter Term for blind Obedience*, &c. 'Tis *according as the Submiſſion is*, that we *aſſert* This, or *not* aſſert it. And This alone is a ſufficient Anſwer to his Argument from thoſe Texts, *Heb.* xiii. 17. and *Matth.* xviii. 17. They prove ſuch a Submiſſion as We grant, not ſuch a one as our *Romiſh* Adverſaries contend for. Does it follow, that becauſe *Eccleſiaſtical Rulers* are to be *Obey'd*, and *contumacious Perſons* to be *Excommunicated*, &c. therefore the Church is to be *implicitly* ſubmitted to; though ſhe affirms that a Triangle and a Circle are the ſame? But what is here wanting in *Subſtance*, is plentifully ſupply'd by *Show*, and *falſe Ap-*

† P. 4. ‡ *Ibid.*

pearance;

pearance; by *Noiſe* and *Bluſtering*, to confound *weak Judgments.* * *It ſeems then St.* Paul *was a rank Impoſtor, when he wrote thus to the* Hebrews; *Obey them that have the Rule over you*, &c. † *Nay, all this Buffoonery will reach the Perſon of Chriſt himſelf; who has declar'd, that he who will not hear the Church* (i. e. *ſubmit to her Deciſions*) &c. ‖ *However, I ſhould not wonder to hear an Atheiſt, or Deiſt, who makes a Mockery of Revelation, diſcourſe in this Manner; but it ſounds very abſurdly in the Mouth of a Proteſtant, who makes profeſſion of believing a reveal'd Religion.* So that becauſe we will not be convinc'd by an Argument, whoſe Premiſes have no more to do with the Concluſion, than empty Swaggering has with ſolid Reaſoning; we muſt immediately be compar'd with Deiſts and Atheiſts. ** *To own all this, I ſay, and at the ſame time ridicule an humble Submiſſion to ſuch Truths?* Meaning, ſuch as are *above our Reaſon.* How do We *ridicule* an humble Submiſſion to *ſuch* Truths? Even becauſe we ridicule an *humble* (*i. e.* an *implicit*) *Submiſſion* to the Church of *Rome.* We do, indeed; and notwithſtanding all This *Fanfaronade*, theſe big Words thrown out to fright us, ſhall continue ſtill to do ſo. Nor ſhall

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‖ *Ibid.* ** *P.* 5.

any Church upon Earth, no not the Universal Church in all Ages, much less the present Church of *Rome*, extort from us such a Submission as is due to God only. Afterwards, if possible, he rises in his Ratling; and concludes thus. * *Is not this sapping the very Foundations of Faith, and encouraging every Body to set up the proud Idol of his own private Judgment, against the Revelation of God, and believe no farther than his poor narrow Capacity can comprehend?* No, 'tis not; nor any thing like it: And that for this *plain* Reason, because the *Church* is not *God:* Let Him prove that it is, and I will *submit* indeed.

Since, therefore, (says the *young Gentleman* †) *Protestants themselves profess the belief of many incomprehensible Mysteries, they submit their Judgments just as we do.* Not exactly, young Gentleman; because You, and your Tutor, and the rest of you, submit your Judgments, not only to *incomprehensible Mysteries*, but also to *flat Contradictions*; not only to the *Scriptures*, but to Things *not contain'd* in the Scriptures, nay, *contrary* to them. We submit implicitly to *God* only; You so submit to your *own Church*; which you shall never persuade us to do; unless your Preceptor, or some body else, can bring

* *P.* 5. † *Ibid.*

better

better Arguments to convince us, than have been brought yet. We do not, therefore, as you ſay we do *; *act incoherently* (a Word, in which You, and your Tutor much rejoyce; meaning by it, I ſuppoſe, *inconſiſtently*) *in ridiculing in you, what we are oblig'd to practiſe ourſelves.*

What follows in the remaining Part of This Page, and in all the next, is true; though not to the Purpoſe.

P. 7. We are taught, that we have *the greateſt Authority upon Earth to aſſure us* [*that God has reveal'd* This or That] *to wit, the Catholick or Univerſal Church; founded by Chriſt Himſelf, and by Him appointed to be our Guide in all ſpiritual Matters.* To which I anſwer, Firſt, The Catholick or Univerſal Church is not the Church of *Rome.* Secondly, The *Authority* of the Catholick Church in This Caſe, is no more than the Authority of a *Witneſs* to a *Matter of Fact*; though Thoſe Words, *to be our Guide in all ſpiritual Matters*, are plainly thrown in, to *confound* Theſe two very *diſtinct* Ideas, *Witneſs to a Fact*, and *Guide in all ſpiritual Matters*: Intending too ſuch a Guide, as muſt be *abſolutely* and *implicitly* believ'd in overy Thing, though never ſo contrary to Scripture, Reaſon, and our Senſes. Thirdly, E-

* *Ibid.*

ven in witnessing to This Fact, that *God has reveal'd*, &c. *i. e.* that the *Scriptures are the Word of God*, the Church does not act in her *spiritual* Capacity; or, more plainly, 'tis not the Church, *as* the Church, but the Body of Christians, consider'd too not *as Christians*, but as *rational*, *honest Men*, and not *Christians only*, much less the *Clergy only*, which is what our Adversaries mean by the *Church* in This Controversy, but *other Men*, even Enemies to Christianity, Jews, Turks, Pagans, who are, or have been, Witnesses to the Genuineness of the Scriptures, or Receivers of them as genuine, or Both; as I have elsewhere observ'd. St. *Austin* (he says*) *declares that nothing but the most insolent Madness could hinder any Man from submitting to its* [*the Church's*] *Decisions.* So say I; provided by *submitting to*, be meant *acquiescing in*, or *not opposing*; and provided those Decisions be in Matters of *Discipline*, or in *obscure difficult* Points of Religion; and St. *Augustin* meant no more. † *And that he would not believe the Gospels themselves, unless the Authority of the Church compell'd him to it:* That is, he would not believe the Gospels to be the Word of God, unless he had sufficient Authority of Testimonies to convince him that they were so:

* *P.* 7. † *Ibid.*

And

And no more would I. Which Authority of Teſtimonies he ſuppoſed to be in the *Church*, or Body of Chriſtians: And ſo do I too, *chiefly*, though not *ſolely*; as I ſaid before.

To paſs over his ſtrange Uſe of Words in That Clauſe, * *the Truth or Nature of the Myſteries*; as if the *Truth* of them, and the *Nature* of them were the ſame; and his affirming that it is *impoſſible we ſhould examine the Truth of a Thing we cannot underſtand*; (becauſe Theſe are Curioſities only by the Bye, and do not at all affect our preſent Controverſy) I ſay, to paſs over Theſe, I go on to what muſt by no means be paſſed over, as it ſtands in the next Page. † *The proper Subject of our Examination is, whether we have ſufficient Motives to believe that ſuch, or ſuch a Point of Doctrine has been effectually revealed by God.* That is *one* Subject of Examination, I grant, and a very great one; but 'tis not the only one. Another is, What is the true *Senſe* and *Meaning* of ſuch or ſuch a Thing, after we are ſatisfy'd it is reveal'd by God. This, I know, our Popiſh Adverſaries will deny: They inſiſt, that for This we muſt abſolutely ſubmit to the Church, and make no uſe of our own private Reaſon. But they muſt prove this, as well as aſſert it; they muſt not take it for granted; for it is

---

* *Ibid.* † *P.* 8.

the

the main Point in Diſpute. Nothing has been urg'd by our Author to prove it as yet; except the two Texts above-mentioned; and how they prove no ſuch thing, has been ſhewn. But, perhaps, he is now proceeding to That Queſtion: For after thoſe Words, *revealed by God*, it follows thus: || *That is to ſay, whether the Proofs and Inducements (commonly called the Motives of Credibility) are of ſufficient Weight to convince a rational Man, that the Church's Authority declaring the Revelation of the Doctrine, may be ſecurely depended upon in the important Concern of our Soul's Salvation.* So that according to him, to *believe that God has reveal'd a Thing*, and to be *convinc'd that the Church's Authority declaring the Revelation of that Doctrine, may be ſecurely depended upon*, is the ſame thing. To ſhew the complicated Sophiſtry of thoſe Words, the *Church's Authority, declaring the Revelation*, I refer back to the Clue of Diſtinctions; as alſo to P. 9, 10. *Motives of Credibility* (for *Motives of Faith*) is only a Soleciſm; and therefore I do not inſiſt upon it. 'Tis agree'd, however, that we are to examine *whether the Church's Authority may be ſecurely depended upon*; i. e. whether we are oblig'd, *abſolutely* and *implicitly* to ſubmit to it. After which our

|| *Ibid.*

Author

Author concludes the Section in theſe Triumphant Words: * *And will any one, after this, have the Confidence to reproach Us, that We oblige our People to proceed blindly, and forbid them to examine the Grounds of their Faith? Nothing, ſurely, but a prejudic'd Heart can prompt them to imagine any ſuch thing.* And I ask, will the Papiſts, after all, ſuffer People to examine the Deciſions of their Church, and contradict and reject any one of them, if they do not like it? Tranſubſtantiation, for Inſtance? If they will not, (as in truth they will not) What do they leſs than require a blind Submiſſion? Oh! but we are permitted to *examine the Grounds* of Faith; becauſe we are permitted to examine, whether the Church *ought* to be thus implicitly ſubmitted to, or *no:* And thus Examination and Submiſſion are reconcil'd. I anſwer, Firſt, This is an *After-thought*; and the *Reformation* may be thank'd for it; as it may for many other Conceſſions from the Church of *Rome*, and in ſome Meaſure for the Reformation of the Church of *Rome* itſelf. *Even now*, 'tis well known that in *Popiſh Countries* People are told, they muſt implicitly ſubmit to the Church's Authority; and *This* Point is no more ſuffer'd to be *canvaſs'd* than any *other:*

* *Ibid.*

'Tis

'Tis *Hereſy* to deny it, or even queſtion it. Secondly, This their Account of the Matter excludes the *moſt material* Part of Examination, *viz.* Whether the Church be *right* in *deciding*, and *explaining* each *particular* Article of Faith. It would, ſurely, be blind Obedience to a King, were we permitted only to enquire whether he had a Right in general to be abſolutely obey'd; but not to enquire whether his Commands were in themſelves juſt and lawful. Thirdly, If (as I ſaid in the Beginning) That Church requires ſuch an abſolute Submiſſion (as all the World grants ſhe does) and yet it is not due, and the Arguments to prove it due, are to the laſt degree trifling and abſurd, (as I have partly ſhewn already, and partly ſhall ſhew hereafter) then notwithſtanding This pretended Liberty of Examination, ſhe ſtill *groundleſsly* and *unreaſonably obliges People to proceed blindly*, as This Gentlemam expreſſes himſelf. Fourthly, Were the Arguments to prove ſuch a Submiſſion as ſeemingly ſtrong and cogent, as any of *that nature* can well be imagin'd; they could not *convince* any rational Man, however they might *puzzle* and *confound* Him. Should I find in the Bible itſelf ſuch a Propoſition as This, *A Piece of Bread is really and truly a human Body*; or, *the ſame Body can be in Ten thouſand Places at once:* I could not believe it. Would I then deny what God affirms? No; but I ſhould

ſhould be ſure God did *not* affirm This. The Text could not be genuine; becauſe God cannot aſſert a Contradiction. Nay, ſhould I *ſee* a Man *raiſe the Dead*, and hear him declare the Propoſitions aforeſaid to be true; I could not believe him: Becauſe I *know* the Things to be *impoſſible* in *Reaſon* and *Nature*. And as for the *Teſtimony of my Senſes*, That Argument would be ſet aſide by the Perſon requiring my Aſſent; becauſe he would require me to believe *contrary to my Senſes:* Beſides, upon the Evidence of *Reaſon* and my *Senſes put together*, I cannot be *ſo ſure* that a *dead Man is really rais'd*, as I am that *thoſe Propoſitions cannot be true*.

To the Second Section.

FAITH is not againſt Reaſon. That is the *Title* of This Section; but why it is, I know not. It might as well have been call'd *A Continuation of the ſame Subject:* Or if it muſt have a *new* Title, it ſhould have been This: *The Church of* Rome *ſuperior to the Scriptures and the Apoſtles*: For That is plainly the Scope of This Section, and, in truth, of the whole Book. *Faith*, however, *is not againſt Reaſon*. It is not, indeed; *i. e.* the *Chriſtian* Faith is *not*; but the

the *Popiſh* Faith *is* againſt *Reaſon*, and our *Senſes* too.

Pray, Sir (ſays * *the young Gentleman) will you do me the favour to explain yourſelf by ſome particular Example.* He means to explain himſelf upon the *Church's Authority*, &c. as in the foregoing Section.

P. *With all my Heart; and I cannot do it better, than by making the Application of what I have ſaid to the Proceedings of the firſt Chriſtians converted by the Apoſtles. The Fact is this; Twelve poor illiterate Men*, &c. and ſo goes on for almoſt two Pages, giving us the Hiſtory of the Converſion of Three thouſand Jews and Gentiles, by the firſt Preaching of the Apoſtles. This is to *puzzle* and *confound*; to make *poor ignorant* People *gape* and *ſtare*, as if ſomething *extraordinary* were coming. He draws his Argument (you ſee) from the *Fountain Head*; begins with the very *Beginnings* of *Chriſtianity*; from whence you are to conclude, that *Chriſtianity* and *Popery* are *one* and the *ſame* thing. Pray obſerve the *Sound* of the Words: *The Fact is this; Twelve poor, illiterate Men in whom there appear'd nothing to recommend them to the Eyes of the World, preſented themſelves on a ſudden in*

* *Ibid.*

the

the open Streets of Jeruſalem, *&c.* They did ſo; and in ſhort they converted Three thouſand Souls: You have it in the Second Chapter of the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, and much better told than it is here. And Thoſe who believed, he tells us, *acted rationally in ſo doing* *, *though the Doctrine contain'd Myſteries ſurprizing to human Reaſon.* Much might be ſaid to ſhew that what was *then* preach'd was not ſo very *Myſterious*, eſpecially to the *Jews*: † But waving That, doubtleſs they acted very rationally in believing; becauſe of our Saviour's *late* Miracles, and That which was *preſent* before their Eyes, the Gift of Tongues in the Apoſtles; and becauſe the Doctrine preach'd had nothing in it contrary to Reaſon, Scripture, or natural Religion, much leſs their Senſes. And from hence is to be deduced a Train of Argumentation to prove the *Church's Authority in declaring*, &c. as aforeſaid: Whereas it might as well have taken its Riſe from the *Creation of the World*, as from the *Converſion of the firſt Chriſtians.* But it looks ſolemnly and pompouſly, as I obſerved; 'Tis a grand *Parade* of *Words*, tho' moſt *impertinent* ones; It *amuſes injudicious* People, and makes their *Heads giddy*; and then they are in an *apt*

* P. 9. † They were in Truth all *Jews*, either *Natives* or *Proſelytes*.

Disposition for the Reception of *Popery*. These *first Converts* to Christianity believ'd *rationally*; *Ergo*, the *Church* of *Rome* is to be believ'd *implicitly*. Nay, he proves it *a fortiori*: For after the *young Gentleman* has ask'd him (as well he might) *what Consequence he draws from thence*; * He answers, *I infer that if these Motives were a sufficient and solid Ground of a rational Submission to the Church's Faith, even in her Infancy, when the Prophecies concerning her future Encrease, Magnificence, and Splendor, were not yet verify'd, as they are now; those we have at present to convince us of the Reasonableness of our relying upon her Authority, are much more forcible, when Millions of Martyrs have seal'd her Faith with the last drop of their Blood; when she has peopled*, &c. and so goes on describing the *glorious State* of the Church (meaning, as always, the Church of *Rome*) *for near upon Seventeen hundred Years*. I desire the Reader to take particular Notice of This Reasoning; for 'tis really a Rarity. *A rational Submission to the Church's Faith!* These three thousand Jews and Proselytes had then *no Thoughts* of a *Church*, as such; much less of her *Authority*, or of Faith, as *Her* Faith. Before their Conversion, the Apostles and Disciples of our Saviour were

* P. 10.

all

all the Church in Being: And did theſe Converts ſubmit to *Them*, upon a Principle of Submiſſion to *Church-Authority?* 'Tis plain they ſubmitted to the Evidence of *Miracles*, ſeconded by *God's Grace*, and to nothing elſe; as our Author himſelf repreſents it in the Words immediately preceding. Why then a Submiſſion to the *Church's* Faith; when *Churchſhip* had nothing to do in the Buſineſs; there being in truth *no Church form'd*, as the Word is *now* us'd. ? The Reaſon is plain: Becauſe all This Writer labours at is eſtabliſhing the *Authority* of the *Church:* And ſo That Word muſt be dragg'd in here, when a *rational Submiſſion* is talk'd of; tho' there is not the leaſt Connexion between the One and the Other.

What follows in the Paſſage cited is an Argument to prove, that the Church of *Rome* (for That is always meant here by *the* Church) is more to be credited, and is of greater Authority, than the *Apoſtles*. They, and the other Diſciples of *Jeſus*, when St. *Peter* preach'd This Sermon, were but *the Church in her very Infancy; when the Propheſies*, &c. *But Thoſe Motives we have at preſent to convince us of the Reaſonableneſs of relying upon her Authority are much more forcible.* Admitting that, all things conſidered, We have now more Evidence for the *Truth of Chriſtianity*, than They had who liv'd in the Days of the Apoſtles, and ſaw

their Miracles, as Some have affirm'd we have; and in *one* Sense it is undoubtedly true: Or more plainly to our present Purpose, admitting that we have now more forcible Motives to convince us of the *Reasonableness of relying upon Their Authority*, than They had who saw them; yet it by no means follows from hence, that We have more reason to rely upon the *present Church's Authority*, than They had to rely upon That of the *Apostles*: And upon another account we have not near so much; Because the Apostles were *inspired*, and the present Church is not.

Neither does our Author's Argument in the least prove his Point; but is egregiously trifling and sophistical. In the first Part of it by the *Church* is meant That in the *Apostles' Days*, and chiefly the *Apostles themselves*; in the other is meant the *present* Church: And yet He jumbles his Words together, as if in both Places it meant the same Thing: *The Church even in* HER *Infancy — At present to convince us* — of HER *Authority*. Every body knows, that the *Sameness* of a *flux*, *successive* Body is not the *same* with That of a *single* Person, or Thing. There is a Quibble too in the Words *Authority*, and *Relying upon* it; which I have before taken notice of. Nor does it follow (to resume the Argument) that because we have *at present* more Evidence for the *Truth*

of

of Chriſtianity, than Thoſe had who liv'd in the *Apoſtles' Days*, (ſuppoſing the Fact to be true) therefore *We* have more Reaſon to rely upon the *preſent Church's* Authority, than *They* had upon That of the *Church then in Being*, *i. e.* chiefly the Apoſtles; tho' They were *divinely inſpir'd*, and the preſent Church is *not*. For I deſire the Reader to conſider, tho' our Author does not, that the *then* Church (like the firſt created Man) tho' an Infant in Age, was adult in Wiſdom, and Authority; and of far greater Authority, than any Church ſince could ever juſtly pretend to.

Looking back upon what I have written, I am both aſham'd and amaz'd to have unawares us'd ſo many Words in vindicating the *Apoſtles* againſt the *Church* of *Rome*. But let Thoſe doubly bluſh, who urge ſuch Arguments, that it is almoſt an Abſurdity to anſwer them. And ſo I leave the odious Subject with This Reflection; that if Popery and Chriſtianity were more conſiſtent with each other, the Defenders of the Former wou'd be forc'd to make uſe of leſs Blaſphemy againſt the Latter.

P. 11. G. *Theſe Motives of Credibility*, *as you call them*, (He might well ſay, *as You call them*, for ſure they were never call'd ſo by any body elſe) *are ſtrong indeed*; *and muſt either ſuffice to render the Church's Teſtimony credible*; *or there is no Teſtimony up-*

on Earth to be securely depended upon.

P. *Whoever examines them seriously, will most certainly find them so.* Instead of *the Church's Testimony* read *the Truth of Christianity*; and there will be more Sense and Truth in it. *And since* (continues the Preceptor) *They contain nothing but Historical Facts, which may easily be examin'd; the Case fairly stated between Protestants, and the Church of* Rome *may be decided by this one Principle; to wit, that it is an indispensable Duty, and by consequence most highly rational, to believe a Thing tho' never so seemingly contrary to Reason, when we have a moral Certainty that God has reveal'd it.*

G. *I think the Principle is self-evident.*

Tho' This Principle, if true, would be of no Service to Him (since the Romanists, as I shall shew hereafter, have not a *moral Certainty*, nor any thing like it, that *God has reveal'd* the Doctrines *they* would *obtrude* upon us) yet I insist that it is so far from being *self-evident*, that it is utterly *false*. *Never so seemingly* contrary to Reason! Sure if a Thing be *as seemingly* contrary to Reason *as possible*, it is *really* contrary to it: At least as to Him, to whom it so seems. If then we have only a *moral Certainty* on the one hand that a thing is so or so, and *infallible Demonstration*, or *self-evident Certainty* on the other, that it is not, and cannot be so, (as it cannot, if it be contrary to Reason) the

the Latter ought to preponderate; nay it will, and muſt, and it cannot be otherwiſe. *A moral Certainty of any Fact* (ſays he * ſpeaking of *Teſtimony* and *external Evidence*) *excludes all reaſonable Doubt of it.* Not ſo, ſay I, if in the *nature of the Thing* there be *more* than *moral* Certainty *againſt* it. Or (if you pleaſe) Things ſtanding thus, I *have not* a moral Certainty of it: Take which you will. || *And if I have no Doubt but God has reveal'd ſuch, or ſuch a thing; I muſt be an Atheiſt, or Madman, not to believe it.* But in the Caſe ſuppoſed, I have *more* than a *Doubt* of it; I am *very ſure* God did *not* reveal it: becauſe God *cannot* reveal a *Contradiction* to Reaſon. † *For my refuſing to believe it in that Caſe is nothing leſs than rejecting, or ſetting at Nought the Teſtimony of God himſelf, whereof I am ſuppos'd to have a moral Certainty.* I anſwer as before, in effect, that in the Caſe ſuppos'd I either *have not* ſuch a moral Certainty, that God *has* reveal'd it: Or if I have, it is *outweigh'd* by ſomething *more* than moral Certainty, that He has *not* revealed it. I put it both ways, to prevent Quarelling about Words. For the further clearing of this Matter, I beg the Reader to caſt his Eye back to P. 14. L. 22. *Fourthly, Were the Arguments*, &c. to the End of the Section.

---

* *Ibid.* || *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

Having shewn This weighty Principle to *be false*; I shall now shew, as I propos'd, that our *Popish* Adversaries can have no *Advantage* from it, *supposing* it were *true.* * *But how do You prove* (says the young Gentleman) *that all controversial Points between Protestants and Us, may be decided by this one general Principle?*

P. *I prove it thus. Whatever Fact has the Testimony of the greatest Authority*, &c. All contain'd in This Paragraph amounts to no more, than that if we have sufficient Evidence attesting any matter of Fact, we ought to believe it: Which is deny'd by no body, that I know of. And what follows to the End of the Section, is to prove that there is such a *moral Certainty*, (founded on the *Church's Authority*) for the ‡ Revelation of all the Points of Christian Doctrine held by Papists, and deny'd by Protestants. The Argument stands Thus. ‖ *Whatever Fact has the Testimony of the greatest Authority*, &c. *But the Revelation of all the Points of Christian Doctrine held by Romanists, and deny'd by Protestants, is attested by such an Authority.* Ergo, &c. Not to insist at present that the *Revelation* (even when it is true) is not properly the *matter of Fact*; but the *Miracles* which are the *Objects of Sense*, are the

---

* P. 11, 12. ‡ P. 12. ‖ *Ibid.*

Facts

Facts to which the Witneſſes give their *Teſtimony*, which *Facts* are *Proofs* of the *Revelation*: I ſay not to inſiſt upon This; ſince our Author calls the *Revelation* of the *Romiſh* Doctrine, as oppoſite to ours, a *Fact*, and puts it (as to the Evidence of it) upon the ſame Foot with *the beſt grounded Hiſtorical Facts*; † I ask him, are we then to conſider it as a *plain hiſtorical Fact atteſted* by the Church, or are we not? If we are not; Why does He talk in this manner? Why does he confound Matters of *Fact* with matters of *Doctrine*? The *Teſtimony* of a *Witneſs*, with the *Authority* of a *Dictator*? If we are; how does the Church (even *their own* Church, the Church of *Rome*) *atteſt* the *Revelation* of the Pope's Supremacy, the Infallibility of the Church, Tranſubſtantiation, Communion in one kind, and twenty more? If ſhe *proves* them from *Scripture*; I am *anſwer'd* as to the *Truth* of them: But This is not *Witneſſing*. If ſhe proceeds upon any other Foot; I ask, Does ſhe *tell* us *when*, and *where*, God revealed them? Does ſhe *tell* us by what *Meſſengers* or *Prophets* He revealed them; and what *Miracles* they wrought as Credentials of their Miſſion? Does ſhe *tell* us whether they were revealed *all in a lump*, or at *different* times? *Nil horum; verboſa, & grandis*, &c. Not one Syl-

† *Ibid.*

lable

lable of all This; but we are told in general, in a confus'd * Huddle of Words (which ſhall be taken to pieces in its proper place) that *the Church* has from Age to Age deliver'd down abundance of *Truths* as *reveal'd* by God, ſome in *Writing*, and ſome by *word of Mouth*, &c. *i. e.* in ſhort, The Church of *Rome* ſays, That all the Church of *Rome* ſays is to be taken for Goſpel. But This is not *witneſſing* to an *hiſtorical Fact*, or *Facts*: 'Tis *Dictating*, not *Witneſſing*; And ſo we are juſt where we were before.

But we proceed. The Thing to be proved is, that the Revelation of the diſtinguiſhing *Romiſh* Doctrines, has the Teſtimony of the greateſt Authority upon Earth; and therefore has a moral Certainty on its ſide. But before our Author comes to prove this, he tells us once more that † *the Principle*, [Viz. *That it is an indiſpenſable Duty, and by conſequence moſt highly rational, to believe a thing, tho' never ſo ſeemingly contrary to Reaſon, when we have a moral Certainty that God has revealed it*] *is certain: And the immediate Conſequence that flows from it is a full Confutation of Atheiſts and*

---

* The ſecond Side of the unpag'd Leaf between *p.* 12, & 13. *Now this Church founded by Chriſt himſelf*, &c. *to* p. 14. *propoſes as reveal'd Truths.*

† 1*ſt*, ſide of the unpag'd Leaf, &c.

Deiſts.

Deiſts. I have ſhewn that it is not very *certain*; nay that it is utterly *falſe* and *abſurd.* What the *immediate Conſequence which flows from it* is. He does not tell us; but I am ſatisfy'd, that Nothing which flows from it can be any Confutation of *Atheiſts* and *Deiſts.* So far otherwiſe, that it would expoſe us to the Scorn of Thoſe Infidels: The Atheiſts would call it *Begging the queſtion*, as ſuppoſing the Being of a God, which He denies; and both He and the Deiſt would ſee the Abſurdity of it, as I do; and yet I am ſure, I am neither an Atheiſt, nor a Deiſt.

But to prevent (continues he †) *your miſtaking my meaning, when I told you that the Caſe fairly ſtated between Proteſtants and the Church of* Rome *may be decided by this one Principle; I pretended not that there is the ſame* extenſive *Evidence, or Teſtimony, for every Article of Faith in which we differ from Proteſtants, as there is for Chriſtianity in General.* No, God knows; becauſe every one of Their Articles of Faith, as diſtinct from Ours, depends entirely upon their own Authority: But the Truth of Chriſtianity is proved by the Authority (meaning the Teſtimony) of the Church Univerſal, and of Others too; as well as by much inter-

† *Ibid.*

nal

nal Evidence. He indeed gives another Reason for his Caution, and 'tis This; * *Because it has happen'd more than once, that the Catholick Church has been silent for some time in reference to Articles of Faith, even allow'd of as such by Protestants. The Reason whereof is, because the Church never decides any Doctrine to be an Article of Faith; 'till after the most diligent Enquiry, and mature Deliberation, and generally upon Occasion of Disputes rais'd about it.* If they are *really* Articles of Faith *now*; they were *always* so: tho' perhaps not so *explicitly declar'd*, nor so *strongly guarded.* I take notice of This; because by *deciding a Doctrine to be an Article of Faith*, the Papists mean *making* it to be so; whereas we utterly deny that the Church has Authority to *make* an Article of Faith.

To shew that, according to our own Principles, we Protestants ought to receive some Points, as *Articles of Faith*, which have not so *extensive an Evidence, as the Truth of Christianity in general*; He instances in *Two*, † which He says we ourselves allow to be *Articles of Faith*; which yet were not always receiv'd as such, and at last were receiv'd as such only upon the Authority of the Church's Decisions. These Points are,

---

*Ibid. † Ibid. and next P.

1*st.* That

1*ſt. That all the Books both of the Old and New Teſtament, as printed in our Bible, were written by Divine Inſpiration.* 2*dly. That Baptiſm adminiſter'd by Hereticks is valid.* I anſwer, 1*ſt.* It is abſolutely falſe that we allow Theſe Points (which, by the way, are ſtrangely coupled) to be *Articles of Faith.* The *Firſt* of them is indeed a *Truth fundamental* to Chriſtianity, and *previous to all our Faith*; but it is not *it ſelf* an *Article of it.* For how is This Point reveal'd to us? In Scripture? That's Circular Arguing, or Proving a Thing by it ſelf. By any other Revelation? We pretend to None; and it would be moſt irrational to expect any. Beſides, This Author himſelf, (as the Tendency of his Argument neceſſarily requires) puts it upon the *Authority of the Church*: And He very well knows, that We do not acknowledge the Authority of the *Church* and the Authority of *God* to be equal; much leſs to be one and the ſame thing. As to what he ſays about the ſuppos'd Uncanonicalneſs of ſome Books for ſome Ages; tho' a great deal might be ſaid to it, yet I paſs it over here; becauſe it does not affect our preſent Argument. The other Point He mentions, was never declar'd by the Church to be an *Article of Faith*; nor do We receive it as ſuch.

I anſwer, 2*dly.* If we did acknowledge Theſe Points to be Articles of Faith, and

That

That upon the Authority of the Catholick Church's Decisions; yet what our Author aims at, would by no means follow. He pursues his Arguments thus. * *If therefore we can produce the Testimony and Authority of the same Catholick Church against them for the Articles disputed between us and them; our Belief of them is grounded upon the same Moral Evidence, or Certainty, as their Belief is of the two above-mention'd Articles.* But we can produce the Testimony, *&c.* I deny the Minor: And let us see how it is proved. † *Now this Church founded by Christ Himself to be our Guide to Heaven; this Church so venerable for her Antiquity, and the lineal Descent;* &c.. THIS *Church, I say,* &c. And I say, WHICH Church? For that the Church of *Rome* is *the* Church, I will never grant. To those Words, *founded by Christ himself, to be our Guide to Heaven;* I answer, *1st.* We are now speaking of the Church as a *Witness,* not as a *Guide.* *2dly.* The *Scriptures* are our *Principal Guide* to Heaven, the *Church* is only our *Secondary;* and the Last is no farther a true Guide, than as itself is guided by the First. || Well; but this Church *hath always attested the following Historical Facts, to wit, that the twelve Apostles* (*the first*

* 2d side *&c.* † *Ibid.* || *P.* 13.

Planters

Planters of her Faith) *were all inſpired Men; that whatſoever they taught relating to the Chriſtian Doctrine, either by Word of Mouth, or by Writing, were Truths revealed by God, and dictated by the Holy Ghoſt.* The Apoſtles were undoubtedly *inſpir'd Men*; and their Doctrines were Truths reveal'd by God: And ſo they would have been, whether the Church had atteſted it, or no. But 'tis the manner of Papiſts to talk as if the Church *made* the Apoſtles and Scriptures of Divine Authority. Whereas the Thing is not therefore true, becauſe the Church atteſts; but the Church therefore atteſts, becauſe the Thing is true: And Others, who never were of the Church, but mortal Enemies to it, atteſt the Truth of many Facts, which prove the Truth of Chriſtianity. †*That they committed theſe Truths, either in Writing, or by Word of Mouth, as a ſacred Truſt, to their Succeſſors, the Biſhops and Paſtors ordain'd by them.* But did they commit them to *no body elſe*? Did they preach and write to no body but Biſhops and Paſtors? Did not they commit them to all, who would hear or read them? According to This way of talking, one would think, at leaſt, that the Apoſtles, immediately before their Death, very *ſolemnly* and

† *Ibid.*

formally

formally gave *Copies* of all the Divine Truths they had written, to the *Biſhops* and *Paſtors*; and *call'd to their remembrance* all they had ſpoken; and that This precious *Depoſitum*, This *ſacred Truſt* (as our Author calls it) was committed to Them *only*. Whereas the Apoſtles (as all the World knows) preach'd the Goſpel *to every Creature*, that would hear them. And the four Goſpels, and the Epiſtles, being written at different Times, and Places, and upon different Occaſions, and to different Perſons, (very few of whom were Biſhops or Paſtors) were received by the Church, as of Divine Authority, ſome ſooner, and ſome later, according as the Evidence of their Authority appear'd: Which Evidence was not produced by Biſhops and Paſtors only. But This again was a Caſt of our Author's skill, to *amuſe ignorant People*, and bewilder their Underſtandings with ſtrange Notions about the *Church*. And the next Words are in the ſame ſtrain. * *That theſe* (Biſhops and Paſtors) *were likewiſe Commiſſioned to deliver them to thoſe who were to ſucceed them in the ſacred Miniſtry*. Which ſuppoſes that the Biſhops and Paſtors *only*, in virtue of their *Commiſſion*, or *holy Orders*, as Biſhops and Paſtors, had

* *Ibid.*

Authority

Authority to *deliver down* the *revealed* Truths, whether *ſpoken* or *written*: And That too *only* to their *Succeſſors in their holy Functions*. Than which nothing can be more contrary to *Reaſon*, or Matter of *Fact*: The Scriptures were diffus'd *all over the World*, as other Books are, by innumerable Copies; and have in all Ages been the Property and Poſſeſſion of private Perſons, Laity as well as Clergy. Of *unwritten* Apoſtolical *Traditions* I ſay nothing; becauſe I deny that there are *any*: Of which hereafter. * *And that by theſe, and their Succeſſors after them*, They *have* thus *been handed down to us for reveal'd Truths from Biſhop to Biſhop, from Paſtor to Paſtor, from Father to Son, and from Generation to Generation, throughout all Ages to this very time, as the Apoſtles' Creed has been.* Thoſe indefinite Words, *they*, and *thus*, leave us at a great Uncertainty. WHAT *Truths, as Heavenly Truths*, are deliver'd, is the main Queſtion between Us and Them; and *That* ſhall be diſcuſſed preſently. THUS *handed down*—— He muſt mean either by *Writing*, or by *Word of Mouth*, or by *both*. All Doctrines pretended to be revealed Truths, and to be handed down to us by *Word of Mouth only*, we utterly reject; becauſe there is no

* *Ibid.*

Proof of their being revealed Truths, unless the Church of *Rome*'s bare Word in her own Cause may pass for Evidence. As for the *Apostles' Creed*, it has been handed down (as every Body knows) both by Word of Mouth, and by Writing. And besides; we receive the Truths contained in it, as Articles of Faith, upon the Authority, not of the *Church*, but of *Scripture*.

We must here observe, that our Author, extends the Word *Church* to the *present* Church; For how can any but the *present* attest a Thing down to *this very time*? And that the Romanists acknowledge no Church but their own, is notorious to the World. The Force of his Argument therefore is, that the Church of *Rome* (for That, according to Him, is *the* Church) in all Ages has, and now does, attest that the *Apostles were inspir'd*, and that what they said, and writ, relating to the Christian Doctrine, were Truths *revealed by God*: And *this* gives us a *moral Certainty*, that *those Facts were true*. You see, *all depends* upon the Church of *Rome*; taking former Ages and the present in conjunction. *This Church* attests (observe the *present* Tense) *and has always attested that the twelve Apostles*, &c. * Now, what if the *present*

* *As above.*

Church

Church of *Rome* ſhould *ceaſe* to *atteſt* theſe things? Why then (according to This Argumentation) *there's an end of our Evidence* for the *Inſpiration of the Apoſtles*, and the *Divine Authority of the Scriptures*. The *Apoſtles* and the *Scriptures* therefore *derive their Authority* (as to Us, or any Uſe we can make of it) from the *preſent* Church of *Rome*. Let This be ſeriouſly conſider'd by the *Chriſtian* Reader. Let it be obſerved too, 2*dly*. That the *Inſpiration of the Apoſtles*, and the *Divine Authority of the Scriptures*, are here put upon the *ſame foot* with *whatever* the Church of *Rome* ſhall *be pleaſed to obtrude* upon us. And 3*dly*. That to eſtabliſh all Her *peculiar Doctrines*, ſhe is both *Judge* and *Witneſs* in her *own Cauſe*; producing no Evidence but *this*, That whatſoever ſhe ſays is true, becauſe ſhe ſays it. *This Church* (*i. e.* the Church of *Rome*) *atteſts*, &c.

Our Author proceeds. * *Theſe, I ſay, are Facts which have the Teſtimony of the Church of Chriſt in all Ages; that is of the moſt credible, and illuſtrious Body or Society of Men upon Earth, to vouch for the Truth of them.* Suppoſing he here underſtood the *Univerſal Church* in our *Proteſtant* Senſe, as 'tis plain he does not; yet even

* *Ibid.*

then his Reaſoning would be moſt abſurd. The Church, when ſhe appears as a *Witneſs* to Facts, proving that ſuch and ſuch Points are *revealed Truths*, muſt lay aſide Her Character of *moſt illuſtrious*; and her Character of *Churchſhip* it ſelf; becauſe ſhe *receives* it from Thoſe *revealed Truths*. To ſay that the *Scriptures*, for inſtance, are divinely inſpir'd, becauſe the *Church*, which is the moſt *illuſtrious* Body, *&c.* ſays they are, when ſhe can no way prove that She *is ſo illuſtrious*, nor that She is a *Church*, but *from* the *Scriptures*, is a mere *Circle*; a Figure in Logick, to which the Papiſts are extremely addicted; and of which our Author will preſently give us ſuch an Example, as, I believe, can hardly be equalled.

The young Gentleman anſwers, † *I own* Sir, *they* (the *Facts*, as above repreſented, and as atteſted by the Church, *i. e.* the Church of *Rome*) *are an unanſwerable Proof of the Truth of Chriſtianity in general.* No, but they are not: So far from it, that they *undermine* Chriſtianity in general, *ſet aſide* the *real*, *irrefragable* Proofs of it, and *ſubſtitute falſe* ones in their ſtead; as I have ſhewn. However, the young Gentleman's next Words are pertinent enough:

† P. 13.

But

* *But what is this to the Point in Queſtion?*

P. *Very much, Sir; for they* (the Facts) *fully ſhew the Weight of the Teſtimony and Authority of the illuſtrious Body, or Society of Men, which we call the Catholick Church in all Ages.* "They *ſhew the weight of the Teſtimony of the Church?* He has all along been proving that the *Teſtimony of the Church ſhews the weight of* Them; Some of it, at leaſt; if their *Truth* be any part of their *Weight*. What follows is more plain. † *In a Word*, they ſhew her to be a Society ſo very ſacred, *that her Teſtimony in any Age is a ſufficient Evidence*, &c. THEY *ſhew* HER? According to the whole Drift of his Argument, SHE ſhews THEM. *To be a Society ſo very ſacred?* &c. Why, he has all along (as we have ſeen) *ſuppos'd* her to be a Society ſo very *Sacred*; and *therefore* of ſufficient Authority to eſtabliſh thoſe Truths by her Teſtimony. Now it ſeems, Thoſe very Truths atteſted by Her, and receiving their Authority from her, give Authority to her, as a Teſtifyer. Obſerve too, by the Way, thoſe remarkable Words *in any Age*: Here he ſpeaks more plainly, confirming what I before took notice of concerning the *preſent* Church. And admirable

---

* *Pag.* 13. and 14. † *P.* 14.

Doctrine it is indeed. But to go on; repeating (as we are forc'd to do) some of the Words already cited. THEY *shew* HER *to be a Society so very sacred; that her Testimony in* any Age *is a sufficient Evidence to make us reasonably believe those things reveal'd which She proposes as reveal'd Truths.* If this be not round, and round, in as true a *Circle* as ever was described; I never saw a Circle in my Life. But tho' by this thrifty and compendious way of Arguing, he proves *the Facts by the Authority of the Church* and *the Authority of the Church by the Facts*; yet Care is taken to set the *Church*'s Authority in the *strongest Light.* It is mention'd last, and closes the whole Argument; that it may make the deeper Impression. *A sufficient Evidence to make us reasonably believe those things reveal'd, which* She *proposes as reveal'd Truths. i. e.* We must still remember, that all reveal'd Truths, whether in the *Scriptures*, or *any where else*, depend upon *Her* Testimony and Authority.

Whence, I infer (says He *) *that We have the same Moral Certainty of the Revelation of Christ's real Presence, for example, in the Blessed Sacrament, of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Honouring of Reliques,* &c. *as both We, and*

* *Ibid.*

Protestants

Proteſtants have of the divine Inſpiration of Scriptures. Becauſe We have the ſame Teſtimony or Authority to rely upon, for the Truth of Both: *Nor can we reaſonably reject the one without rejecting the other. And then we may bid Adieu to all reveal'd Religion.* Chriſt's *real Preſence*, as diſtinct from *Tranſubſtantiation*, need not have been menti-on'd; becauſe we do not deny a *ſpiritual real* Preſence. To the reſt I anſwer: We have *not* the ſame Teſtimony or Authority to rely upon for the Truth of *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Purgatory*, &c. as we have for the Truth of the *divine Inſpiration* of the *Scriptures*. For the Latter, we have the Teſtimony of the Church *univerſal*; and in ſome meaſure of Thoſe, who are *out* of the Church. We have as much Proof of it, as the nature of the Thing will admit; and *no Fact* was ever *better atteſted*. For the Former, we have only the Church of *Rome* witneſſing and judging in her *own Cauſe*; in direct *oppoſition* to the Teſtimony and Authority of all *other* Churches, and of the *Holy Scriptures* too, which ſhe *acknowledges* to be *divinely inſpir'd*: So that we may ſafely reject *Popery*, without bidding adieu to all *reveal'd Religion*. Nay, we cannot *acknowledge* the Firſt, without *contradicting* and *undermining* the Laſt. *If the Teſtimony or Autho-*

rity of the Church (He argues †) *ſuffices to convince* a Proteſtant's *Judgment of the Inſpiration of Scriptures, and to oblige him to venture his Soul's Salvation upon the Belief of it; why will not the ſame Teſtimony and Authority oblige him likewiſe to believe the Revelation of the other Articles juſt now mention'd?* I anſwer, 1ſt. as before, I have *not the ſame* Teſtimony and Authority for Both. 2*dly*, If the Scriptures were *not* divinely inſpir'd; my Belief that they *are*, would not hazard my *Soul's Salvation*. 3*dly*. I have not only *not the ſame* Evidence for the Truth of the Popiſh Tenets, as I have for That of the Inſpiration of the Scriptures; but I have *no* Proof of it *at all*; nay, I have direct proof *againſt* it, both from *Scripture*, and the Teſtimony and Authority of the *Church*. Therefore 4*thly*. The Belief of *them* would *indeed* hazard my *Soul's Salvation*; becauſe they are *wicked* as well as *falſe*, and directly *contrary to the Word of God*. But He goes on. * *For either the Church, appointed by Chriſt to be our Guide, may be ſecurely rely'd upon; or not. If not; a Proteſtant's Belief of the Inſpiration of Scriptures is raſh, and inconſiderate. But if it may be ſecurely rely'd upon; he acts in-*

† *Ibid.* P. 14. 15.

cohe-

coherently in not believing the other Articles declar'd by her to be reveal'd Truths.

G. *I confeſs I do not ſee by what Slight or Artifice Proteſtants can eſcape from the two Horns of this Dilemma. For whether they ſay Yes, or No; it gives their Church a mortal Blow.* You are very complaiſant to your Tutor, young Gentleman; but 'tis really more Your Goodneſs, than his Deſert. If You, Sir, *don't ſee how we can eſcape*; I think, I do: Nor is ſo much *ſleight, or artifice* requir'd, as You imagine: So far from it, that they are a Couple of the *weakeſt Horns* that ever *puſh'd*. But why muſt we needs ſay *Yes*, or *No*, without any *more a-doe?* Did your Tutor never tell You that, in ſome Caſes, before we ſay Yes, or No, 'tis requiſite to *diſtinguiſh?* If by the *Church* be meant the Church of *Rome*; I deny that *She* was *appointed by Chriſt to be our Guide*: and moreover to the firſt Horn I anſwer, *No*; She is *not* to be *ſecurely rely'd upon*: So far otherwiſe, that She is the falſeſt Witneſs, the moſt corrupt Judge, and the blindeſt Guide, upon the Face of the Earth. Nor does it follow, that becauſe *She* is not to be ſecurely rely'd upon, therefore a *Proteſtant's Belief of the Inſpiration of the Scriptures is raſh and inconſiderate*; becauſe He has *other*, and much *better*, Proof that the Scripture is inſpired, than *her* Authority. This being ſo, the other Horn is of courſe uſeleſs.

For

For the Caſe ſtanding, as I have ſaid; the Proteſtant does *not act incoherently in not believing the other Articles declar'd by Her* (the Church of *Rome*) *to be reveal'd Truths.* If by the Church be meant the *univerſal* Church, or the *Catholick* Church *truly* ſo called; I anſwer, 1*ſt.* Even *She* is only a Guide in *Subordination* to the *Scripture*; and if She ſhould teach any thing *plainly contrary* to the *plaineſt* Scripture, or to *Reaſon*, or to our *Senſes*; it ought to be rejected. Therefore 2*dly. She may be ſecurely rely'd upon*, when ſhe atteſts a *plain Fact*; eſpecially when the Fact is proved by other Evidence, both *external* and *internal*: but not if ſhe ſhould teach things plainly contrary *&c.* as aforeſaid. 3*dly. She* neither *does*, nor ever *did* teach ſuch things, tho' the Church of *Rome* does; nor does *She* pretend that there are *any* reveal'd Truths, but what are in *Scripture.* 4*thly.* Therefore, as to the 1*ſt* Horn, *a Proteſtant's Belief of the Inſpiration of Scripture is not raſh and inconſiderate*; becauſe He believes it upon the Teſtimony of the *Catholick Church*, and upon *other* Evidence; all which put together amounts to a *Demonſtration*, as far as any *Fact* is capable of it. As to the 2*d*, He does *not act incoherently in not believing the other Articles declar'd by* HER, *to be revealed Truths*; becauſe *She* declares not any to be ſo, but what are in *Scripture*; every Tittle

Tittle of which the Proteſtant believes: Or if She did, He would not *act incoherently* in not believing them, eſpecially if they were *contrary* to Scripture *&c.* becauſe one may rationally rely upon a Perſon or number of Perſons, when They affirm nothing but what is rational; and yet not rely upon them, when They affirm what is irrational, impious, or abſurd. There is a ſhameful Sophiſm therefore in Thoſe Words *ſecurely rely'd upon*. You might have told Your Tutor, if he had tutor'd you as he ought to have done; that 'tis the *Fallacy*, call'd *A dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*. You may obſerve (if You pleaſe) that I have given You more than I owed You: For to break *one* Horn of a *Dilemma* is ſufficient at any time; But I think I have effectually broken *Both*.

To the next Paragraph (obſerving in a Word that *Witneſſing*, and *Deciding*, *Teſtimony*, and *Guide*, are here confounded, as before) I anſwer; that *God* has undoubtedly *given us ſufficient means to know what Truths He has revealed, what not:* But that the *Church of Chriſt*, as it ſignifies the *Church of Rome*, is *not a ſufficient means to convey down ſecurely to us all reveal'd Truths*, for the Reaſons aforeſaid. And the Proteſtant being *deſired*, or rather challeng'd, *to mark out ſome better and ſurer Guide*, (it ſhould be *means of Conveyance*) does with great Intrepidity *mark out* the *Holy Scriptures*, and the Arts

of

of *Writing* and *Printing* them; together with the *Teſtimony* of the Univerſal *Church*, and Others, concerning them. If he means the Church *truly* univerſal in *our* Senſe; the Argument will do him no ſervice, for the Reaſons above alledg'd.

Nor is This *eluding the Difficulty, inſtead of clearing it*; as He with ſufficient Confidence is pleas'd to affirm. † To ſhew the Weakneſs of his Reaſons for This Aſſertion, We will ſuppoſe at preſent (for Argument's ſake, and for it's greater ſtrength on our ſide) that the Church of *Rome* is the Catholick Church, or elſe that He means the Catholick Church as *We* do; That We have *no* Evidence for the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, *but* the Teſtimony of the Catholick Church; And laſtly, that the Catholick Church (as we mean it) delivers down all the *Popiſh* Doctrines as reveal'd Truths. I ſay we will ſuppoſe all This on Their ſide, tho' not one Word of it is true; Even then let us ſee how his Argument will ſtand. *For it remains ſtill unanſwered* (ſays He ‖) *how a Proteſtant, without relying upon the Church's Teſtimony, or Authority, can have a rational Motive to aſſure him of the divine Inſpiration of the Scriptures. And if he be obliged to depend upon her Teſtimony in this capital*

† *P.* 16. ‖ *Ibid.*

Point &

Point; how can he reaſonably refuſe to pay the ſame Submiſſion to her in other Articles, as poſitively declared by Her to be reveal'd Truths, as the divine Inſpiration of the Scriptures? For ſurely all the Motives of Credibility are as ſtrong on her ſide in her Teſtimony of the one as of the other. To paſs over his Abſurdity above-mention'd, in calling the *Divine Inſpiration of the Scriptures*, a *reveal'd Truth*; I anſwer, (as I have, in effect, done ten times over already) It does not follow, that becauſe a Man may be ſafely depended upon as a *Witneſs*, that ſuch a one *ſaid*, or *writ* ſo or ſo; therefore He has *Authority* to *interpret* it as he pleaſes; or that he is to be *believed*, tho' his Interpretation be manifeſtly *contrary* to the plain Meaning of the Words, to common Reaſon, to Religion, and our Senſes. A Man may produce good Proof, that certain Writings (concerning an Eſtate) in his Keeping, are true and genuine; and I may admit of his Teſtimony in This Caſe: Yet am not therefore oblig'd to admit the Senſe which he puts upon the particular Expreſſions contain'd in them. It happens every Day in the Courts of Juſtice; One who allows Another to be a good Witneſs, that a Deed is genuine, does not think he acts inconſiſtently, if notwithſtanding That he diſputes the Senſe of it with him.

I have only to add, That there is a precious Sophiſm lurking in thoſe Words, *this capital Point*; inſinuating, belike, an Argument *a majori ad minus.* "If we muſt believe the Church aſſerting the Divine Inſpiration of the Scriptures, upon which all Chriſtian Truths depend; much more muſt we believe Her in other Articles *&c.*" I anſwer; That *Point* may be the moſt *Capital*, and yet *witneſſing* to it may not be, and in reality is not, an Act of ſo great *Authority*, (nay properly ſpeaking, it is no Authority at all) as *declaring*, *deciding*, *defining*, i. e. in ſhort, as They manage it, *making* other Articles, tho' *leſs* Capital. A Prince's Title to the Crown is a very capital Point; yet Witneſſing to it, and proving it (which the meaneſt private Subject may do) is not near ſo *capital* an Act, as uſurping an Authority to interpret his Laws, quite contrary to their plain Meaning; and to make Laws, not only *without* him, but in open Defiance *of* him. This, by the way, would, I doubt, be called a *Capital Crime*; and the Perſon, notwithſtanding his good Service to the King in proving his Title, would have uncommon good Luck, if he did not meet with *Capital Puniſhment.*

To the Third Section:

WHICH has for its Title; * *Faith depends in a different manner on the Teſtimony of God, and on the Teſtimony of Men.* If He pleaſes, Faith is *two-fold*; Human and Divine. By *Human*, We believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God; and by *Divine*, We believe whatever is contained in them to be true.

All in This, and the next Page, I paſs over; as being partly anſwer'd already, and partly nothing to the Purpoſe; (tho' had I a Mind to be Critical, I could eaſily point out ſome *Inaccuracies*, not to ſay Abſurdities in it) 'till we come to Theſe Words: † *For this Reaſon*, (*Viz.* becauſe it is neceſſary to depend upon the Church's Teſtimony for reveal'd Truths) St. *Paul* ſaith, *that Faith is by hearing*, Rom. 10. *v.* 17. *to wit, by hearing the Voice of the Church, appointed by God to be our Guide. For unleſs we hear the Voice of the Church ſpeaking to us by the Mouths of her Biſhops and Paſtors; how ſhall we know what are reveal'd Truths and what not?* No doubt, ordinarily ſpeaking, *Faith comes by Hearing*; and by *Read-*

---

* *P.* 16. *P.* 17, 18.

ing

ing likewiſe: For I hope the Gentleman will not ſay, that the Apoſtle by mentioning one intended to exclude the other. The Church too, ordinarily ſpeaking, that is, her Biſhops, and Paſtors, are to be heard: But it is *poſſible* that Faith may come *without* Hearing, *i. e.* by Reading *only*. And even when we *do hear* the Church; it is not proved from This Text, that we are to *believe* her, when we *hear* her teach Things directly *contrary* to what we *read*: I mean in the Holy Scripture. To That Queſtion therefore, *Unleſs We hear the Voice of the Church*, &c. *How ſhall We know what are revealed Truths, and what not?* I anſwer, by *reading the Bible*; and conſidering the *Evidence* which proves it to be the *Word of God*. The next Paragraph, * *The Voice of the Church is an Echo between the Word of God and us*, &c. (ſetting aſide the ſtrange Fantaſticalneſs, and indeed Nonſenſe, of the Expreſſion) is nothing but the *ſame* over and over again; and has been anſwered over and over already.

† We are told in the next place, *Why*, tho' the Church is *infallible*, he has hitherto not conſidered Her *as ſuch*; *but barely as a creditable illuſtrious Society*.

Reminding the Reader of my having ſhewn

---

* *P.* 18. † *P.* 18. & 19.

that

that to prove the Scripture by the Church, even as an *illuſtrious*, tho' not *infallible* Society, is a mere Circle; I ſhall conſider the Reaſons He alledges. * *Firſt*, (ſays he) *becauſe her Teſtimony, barely as ſuch, ſufficeth alone to render our Belief of the Revelation even of the darkeſt and ſublimeſt Myſteries perfectly rational: Which is the Point I juſt now undertook to prove.* But I have fully ſhewn you have *not proved it*; whatever You *undertook*. If the Myſteries the Church puts upon us, are *not* in Scripture; they are not to be believed: as I ſhall ſhew, when we come to the Article of *Tradition*. If they *are* in Scripture; We believe them upon the Authority of *God*, not of the *Church*; tho' the Church's Teſtimony goes a great way to prove the Scripture in general to be God's Word. Beſides; I tell you again and again, that if the Myſteries be not only *dark* and *ſublime*, but downright *Contradictions*, as Yours are; they *cannot* be a part of God's Word, and no Body in his Wits can believe them.

His other Reaſon alledg'd by Him, why He has not yet conſidered the Church as Infallible, tho' he inſiſts that it really is ſo, † is *to avoid the juſt reproach of ſuppoſing what He ought firſt to prove. For* (ſays he) *the*

* *P.* 19. † *P.* 19.

Church's Infallibility is itſelf a reveal'd Truth; and if I ſhould prove the Reaſonableneſs of my Belief of it from the Church's Teſtimony conſider'd as Infallible, my Argument would run Thus: 'Tis reaſonable to believe that the Church's Infallibility is a reveal'd Truth, becauſe the infallible Church declares it to be ſo,; which is the ſame abſurd way of Arguing, as if I ſhould ſay, it is reaſonable to believe a thing is ſo, becauſe it is ſo. But ſince the Church's Teſtimony, tho' conſider'd barely as the Teſtimony of Men, has the ſame Weight and Authority in declaring to us the divine Revelation of her own Infallibility as it has in declaring all other Reveal'd Truths; I act as rationally in ſuffering myſelf to be directed by her Judgment in This Point, as in any other. Here the Gentleman would fain avoid the famous *Circle* of the Romaniſts: But tho' He does not run into it ſo *groſſly* as Some of them have done; and as He himſelf has done into ſome others, which I have taken notice of; Yet what He ſays *amounts* to much the ſame thing. He does not indeed argue, *that 'tis reaſonable to believe that the Church's Infallibility is a reveal'd Truth, becauſe the infallible Church declares it to be ſo*; but He argues that we muſt believe the *Church* to be *Infallible*, becauſe the *Church ſays ſo*, tho' She be not *conſidered* as *Infallible*, *while* She ſays ſo. And where is the mighty difference? She

ſtill

ſtill proves her own Authority *by* her own Authority: For *Infallibility* implys *Authority* in the higheſt degree. After all, therefore, is the Church's Authority (whether ſhe be conſidered *as* Infallible, or no) to be *abſolutely* and *implicitly* ſubmitted to, when She declares reveal'd Truths, and among the reſt *her own Infallibility*; or is it not? If it be *not*; there's an End of what our Author has been labouring all this while, and indeed of the whole Popiſh Cauſe. If it *be*; how can ſhe be *more* ſubmitted to, if She be conſider'd *as* Infallible? Or what does it *ſignify*, whether She be conſidered as Infallible, or no? Can a *greater* Submiſſion than an *abſolute* and *implicit* one be yielded to God himſelf? If this Author ſhould reply (for I would fain prevent all Wrangling about Sounds) that he has not us'd the Words *abſolute* or *implicit* as join'd with Submiſſion to the Church; I anſwer, 1ſt. The young Gentleman *P.* 2. ſays without any reproof from his Preceptor, and therefore we may ſuppoſe with his approbation, that He (the Preceptor) *has often told him, we are bound to pay an entire Submiſſion to the Deciſions of the Catholick Church.* What does *entire* mean, leſs than *abſolute* and *implicit*? 2*dly*. By Submiſſion to the Church, does he all along mean an *abſolute* and *implicit* one (tho' he leaves out the Words) or does he not? If he does *not*; He has been beating

the Air: For *We* acknowledge a Submiſſion to the Church, ſo far as it is conſiſtent with Reaſon and Scripture; we being allow'd the free uſe of Both. If he *does*; the Argument ſtands juſt as it did before: and ſo I leave it.

What follows to the End of the Section, except the laſt Paragraph, has nothing in it, but a Repetition of what has been even frequently repeated by him, and, to my great Trouble, by me likewiſe; and is, beſides, little or nothing to the Matter in hand. I only obſerve that tho' he ſeems ſo carefully to *diſtinguiſh* between *Divine* and *Human* Faith; yet he in effect confounds them with each other. For, as I took notice above, his Doctrine is, that even *human* Faith (Faith in the Church) muſt be *implicit*; and what can *divine* be more?

The laſt Paragraph runs thus. * *Now amongſt many other Truths clearly deliver'd in holy Writ, That of the Church's Infallibility may juſtly claim an eminent place: tho' Proteſtants uſe their utmoſt Efforts to ridicule what they cannot ſolidly confute.* That will ſoon be ſeen; *viz.* in the Examination of

* P. 20.

The

The Fourth SECTION;

ENTITULED,

The Church of Chriſt conſider'd as Infallible.

* HERE we have, in a great deal of ſcurrilous Language, a tedious and moſt impertinent Declamation about *Prejudice* and *Self-intereſt*; by which alone (if we will believe This Writer) Proteſtants are hinder'd from acknowledging ſo *clear* and *evident* a *Truth*, forſooth, as the *Infallibility of the Church*; underſtanding (as always) the Church of *Rome*. It is eaſy for Them to ſay This; and full as eaſy for Us to ſay, that it may with great advantage be retorted upon Themſelves; that We, as to This matter, are free from the Guilt here charg'd upon us, as They are deeply involv'd in it; and that nothing but the *blindeſt Prejudice*, or the ſtrongeſt Attachment to *worldly Intereſt*, could prevail with them to maintain ſo ſenſeleſs and ridiculous a Notion. As there is no Argument in *Declaiming*, and *Railing*, upon *ſup-*

* P. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25; 28, 29.

poſition that a Thing is *true*, which is the very Point to be *prov'd*; in telling us, that *Prejudice* and *Covetouſneſs* are very *bad Things*, and ſo forth; what I have now ſaid in one Word, is a ſufficient Anſwer to conſiderably above Half of This *Section*. For the reſt, it will be more than ſufficient to make ſome ſhort Remarks upon our Author's more *ſingular Sayings* within That Diviſion; and then to give a *full Anſwer* to his Arguments from the *Texts* of *Scripture*, which he urges as ſo many *Proofs* of the *Church's Infallibility*.

To run down the Church's Infallibility (He ſays *) *is our All*. Be it ſo: Is it not Their All to defend it? The Queſtion is which Party maintains its *All* beſt; and of That let Mankind judge.

As idle is it, to tell us that † *all the reform'd Churches, tho' diſagreeing among themſelves in many other Doctrinal Points, join unanimouſly in oppoſing this*. And Reaſon good; becauſe 'tis ſo notoriouſly falſe. Was there ever ſuch Trifling? But do all the reformed Churches agree in oppoſing no *other* Doctrine of the Papiſts but This? Sure they do, in oppoſing many more; not that it is in the leaſt material, whether they do or no.

---

* P. 22. † P. 22.

His

His Reflection upon the *thorough godly Reformation* (as He Ironically † ſpeaks) with regard to the *Ends* and *Views* of Thoſe who begun and promoted it, might have been ſpared here, were not *Scandal* ſo delicious a Morſel; becauſe 'tis nothing to the preſent *Point*, as he himſelf in effect acknowledges: And becauſe he has ſaid ſo much upon it in his *Preface*, and *Third Dialogue*, to which it properly belongs; and in the Examination of which, it ſhall not fail to be conſider'd. At preſent I paſs it over, as entirely foreign to the Point in hand.

Speaking of the barbarous Uſage the poor innocent Church of *Rome* receiv'd at the Reformation, He has theſe Words. * *Tho' they had themſelves acknowledg'd and reſpected her for ſeveral Years, as the beautiful Spouſe of Jeſus Chriſt, without Spot or Wrinkle in her Faith; They could, at that time, ſee no Remains in her of her former Beauty.* That is, THO' they had been long in Ignorance and Error; YET now they open'd their Eyes, and were reſolv'd to grow wiſer and better. What a horrid Abſurdity, and Wickedneſs, were they guilty of? He goes on. † *The venerable Antiquity of her Doctrine, her Catholicity, the Luſtre of her*

† *P.* 23. * *Ibid.* † *P.* 23, 24.

Miracles, the Statelineſs and Solemnity of her Hierarchy, deriv'd from the Apoſtles themſelves, the Celibacy of her Clergy, the auſtere Lives of her religious Orders, and the Majeſty of her publick Service (all which had in former Ages render'd her the Admiration of Mankind) and with their powerful Attractives drawn multitudes of Infidels into her Fold, had then loſt all their Charms in the Eyes of her own rebellious Children. This is a ſad *Lamentation* indeed; but it *ſuppoſes* half a dozen Particulars to be *true*, which *are* utterly *falſe*. Her *Doctrine*, I own, was pretty *ancient* (as many other damnable Errors are) but not near ſo ancient as *Chriſtianity*; with reſpect to which, it is a pure *Novelty*. Nor is every thing *venerable* that is *ancient*: If it were, *Original Sin* would be more venerable than *Popery* it ſelf. Her *Catholicity* (as He calls it, We ſay *Catholiciſm*) is a *Chimæra*; for ſhe is *Catholick* in *no ſenſe* of the Word. The Luſtre of her *Miracles* is nothing; for ſhe never worked *any*; but has made her ſelf *infamous* and *ridiculous*, in *pretending* to That Power. The *Hierarchy* other Churches have, as well as *She*; and that too *deriv'd from the Apoſtles themſelves*: And if they have it not ſo *ſtately* and *ſolemn*, as She has; 'tis becauſe *Their* Clergy are not ſo *rich*, *proud*, and *powerful*, as *Hers*, and do not place ſo much Religion in outward

ward *Pomp* and *Oſtentation*. Her injoining *Celibacy* upon the *Clergy* is *unlawful*, and attended with *pernicious Conſequences*. The *Lives* of many of Her *Religious Orders* are not *auſtere*, but *voluptuous*; Others are *more auſtere* than they *ought* to be; are both the Effect and the Cauſe of *much Superſtition*; or, at beſt, do more hurt to Religion than good. What He calls the *Majeſty of her publick Worſhip*, is *Foppery* amd *Formality*, contrary to the Genius of the *Goſpel*, and does infinite *Miſchief* to the *Souls* of Men. Theſe things might *in former Ages render Her the Admiration of Mankind*, (i. e. *a great part* of it; for if he means more, it is not true) but *Mankind* was *ignorant* and *wicked*; and Mankind is often *miſtaken*: And if *Infidels were drawn into her Fold by theſe Attractives*, they were drawn into it upon a *wrong* Principle. Nor were *her Children*, of whom he ſpeaks, *rebellious*: Becauſe it was their Duty to *obey God*, *rather than men*. If it be objected, that I have only *ſaid*, but not *prov'd*; I ſay the ſame of Him, and ſo we are even: Here, I mean; for upon the whole we are not ſo. Becauſe I have *elſewhere prov'd* what I have here aſſerted; * Let Him diſprove it, if He can.

---

* Popery truly ſtated, &c.

P. 24. *As for the Fathers, They easily got rid of them, by saying they were all Parties, and avow'd Abetters of Popery. To what purpose (said the couragious* Martin Luther) *should any Man rely on the ancient Fathers?* &c. *Luther* is but *One*, and so cannot answer to the Word *They*. And however contemptuously he spoke of the Fathers, or whatever other foolish or wicked things he is supposed to have said, or done, 'tis nothing to Us, or to our Cause: The same, and much more (We having, in truth, nothing to do with Him) being to be said with relation *to Him*, which shall be said with relation to some of our *first Reformers* here in *England*, in answer to the *Preface*, and *Third Dialogue*; whither I refer the Reader. For *our selves*; next to the *Scriptures*, we desire to be try'd by the Writings of the *Fathers*: Nor do any Writings, except the Former, give fuller Testimony *against* the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, than the Latter.

P. 25. *As to the Faith of former Ages; besides that both* Luther, *and* Calvin, *confess'd without Hesitation, that they had separated themselves from all the pre-existing Churches in the World; the Book of Homilies, highly valued by the Church of* England, *declares positively that both Laity and Clergy, Learned and Unlearned, all Ages, Sects, and Degrees of Men, Women, and Children,*

Children, of whole Chriſtendom, have been, at once, drowned in abominable Idolatry; and that for the ſpace of EIGHT HUNDRED YEARS, AND MORE. *Which, tho' in very abuſive Language, is a full Acknowledgment of a Fact which does no honour to the Reformation; to wit, that not one of the reformed Churches had a viſible Being in the World for eight hundred Years, and more: And ſo the Faith of former Ages, ſtigmatiz'd indeed with the injurious Title of abominable Idolatry, was fairly given up to the Church of* Rome, *and acknowledged to have been wholly on the Popiſh ſide.* Tho' whatever *Luther* and *Calvin* ſaid, it affects not *Us* or *our Cauſe*; and the ſaying of *ſome* falſe things deſtroys not even *their perſonal* Reputation; ſo that ſuppoſing what our Author here affirms to be true, it is nothing to his purpoſe; yet it may well be anſwer'd: *Firſt*, *Where* do they confeſs this? Why does he not *quote* the Books and Pages? *Secondly*, Their Words, ſuppoſing them to be the ſame which are here ſet down, may be very well explain'd in a *ſound ſenſe*; ſo as not to prejudice Them, or their Reformation. For Example, *They ſeparated themſelves from*, &c. *i. e.* They were *oblig'd* in Conſcience *not to communicate externally with*, *&c.* The *Separation*, properly ſpeaking, being made by their *Adverſaries*, not by *Them.* Not that This is matter of *Faith*, after

after all, but of *Practice:* And besides, the Word *Former*, as apply'd to *Ages* by This Writer, is very ambiguous; of which hereafter.

As to the Quotation out of the *Book of Homilies*; it shall be fully considered, partly here, and partly elsewhere: our Author laying great stress upon it, and twice repeating it; *viz.* P. 115 & 280. Reckoning (as indeed I think it ought to be reckon'd) the *Prevalency* of the *Idolatry* here spoken of (*viz. Image-Worship*) from the establishing of it by the 2d Council of *Nice* in the Year 787 to the Year 1550, when it may be said to have been in These Parts of *Europe* pretty well abolish'd; the Homilist is mistaken by 38 Years, supposing by 800 and more, he meant just *one* more. And let our Author make the most of This Concession: We do not pretend that the Homilies are *Infallible*: We subscribe only to the main Substance and Doctrine of them, not to every Word contain'd in them. But as He reckon'd a little higher; 'tis no more than an Hyperbolical Expression, at most, as to the Prevalency of the Corruption; and may very well be justify'd. For Those Words *Laity and Clergy, Learned and Unlearned, all Ages, Sects, and Degrees of Men, Women, and Children, of whole Christendom, have been drown'd*, &c. do not import (as This Author in P. 280, most fallaciously

ciouſly takes it for granted) that there was not *one ſingle Clergyman or Layman*, but was *drowned in Idolatry*; The plain Meaning is, that *Perſons* of *all* Orders, Ages, Sects, *&c.* not that *all* Perſons of all Orders, Ages, Sects, *&c.* were ſo corrupted: That Laſt is not ſaid, nor any thing like it.

The pretended *full acknowledgment of a Fact which does no honour to the Reformation, to wit*, &c. Shall be fully conſidered, when we come to *P.* 115. where it is repeated, and to which it more properly belongs. *Viſibility* ſhall likewiſe be conſider'd in its proper place. At preſent we are upon *Infallibility*. Here therefore I only ask our Author, when he ſays The *Faith of former Ages was given up to the Church of* Rome; *what former Ages* He means? If He means the *firſt* and *pureſt* Ages, agreed to be ſo even by Themſelves; for inſtance, the firſt 300 Years; I abſolutely deny his Aſſertion. For 1*ſt*. We do not *ſtigmatize the Faith* (the *Practice*, it ſhould be) of *Thoſe* Ages with the *Title of Idolatry*. Nor 2*dly* do we *give it up to the* Church of *Rome*, nor acknowledge it to have been *wholly*, or *at all*, *on the Popiſh ſide*; but inſiſt upon the direct contrary. 3*dly*. The Homily cannot mean *Thoſe* Ages: For 801 Years from the Reformation backwards (reckoning the Reformation in the Year 1550) will not bring us up to the laſt Day of *Them* by 449 Years. If by *former Ages* He

He means *Popiſh* Ages; no doubt we fairly give up the Faith of *Them* to the Church of *Rome*, and acknowledge it to have been wholly on the Popiſh ſide.

However, if we will take things as This Writer repreſents them; He could produce abundant proof of *the* Church's *Infallibility* * *from the unanimous Teſtimony of the Antient Fathers, and from the conſtant Faith of former Ages*; But waves it, becauſe Proteſtants, he ſays, deny the Authority of Both.

But as to the Texts of Holy Scriptures (He adds †) *which Proteſtants own to be divinely inſpir'd, and by Conſequence out of the Reach of a godly Reformation*, &c. Certainly the Gentleman forgets Himſelf; otherwiſe He would not have given us This unlucky Hint, putting us in mind of the *Popiſh* godly *Reformation* of the *Scriptures*; which the *Romaniſts* have ſo reformed in ſeveral places, as to *ſtrike* out ſome Words, and *put in* others. This is a *godly Reformation* which *Proteſtants* never attempted; It belongs wholly to *Papiſts*. And ſo That witty Irony upon us might have been let alone.

It ſeems, however, as to *Texts of Scripture* upon the Article of *Infallibility*, we are ‡ *put to very hard ſhifts. For the Texts are clear, and ſtrong; and muſt be tortur'd in*

* P. 24. † P. 25. ‡ P. 25.

the

the moſt unmerciful manner, or read backwards, to diſcover any thing in them but the Church's perpetual Infallibility, ſettled upon the moſt ſolid Foundations. Theſe Words are introductory to his *Scripture-Proofs* of the Church's *Infallibility*; meaning too (as every where elſe) the Church of *Rome*. If Thoſe Proofs be indeed *irrefragable*; let This *big Talk* paſs off unreflected upon. But if, on the contrary, there be not the *leaſt Glimpſe* of an Argument in them; if the Texts alledg'd be alledg'd moſt *impertinently*, and have no more to do with the matter in Diſpute, than the firſt Verſe in *Geneſis* has with the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*; all which I undertake to prove immediately: then his Charge of *torturing, and reading backwards*, returns upon Himſelf; All This *Apparatus* is nothing but empty Swaggering, and the Perfection of Impudence; which deſerves any other ſort of Treatment almoſt that can be nam'd, rather than an Anſwer. Now then to the Buſineſs.

* G. *Pray, Sir, do me the favour to let me hear thoſe Texts.* You have reaſon, Young Gentleman: For after a *Preparation* of *five Pages*, 'tis really high time to come

---

* P. 26.

to

to the Arguments themſelves; which take up juſt *half* That Quantity of Paper.

P. *The firſt is Chriſt's poſitive Promiſe to build his Church upon a Rock, and that the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* Matth. 6. *v.* 18. *For if the Word of God may be ſecurely depended upon; nothing ſurely can be clearer, and ſtronger than this Promiſe. Since it is manifeſt, that if the Church of Chriſt were ever guilty of the damnable Errors Proteſtants have charg'd her with; the Gates of Hell would have effectually prevail'd againſt her, and her Divine Founder prov'd falſe to his Word.*

G. *That's Blaſphemy with a Witneſs.*

So much Blunder, Inconſequence, Fallacy, and Falſhood, was, I believe, ſcarce ever *crouded into ſo few Words before.* Suppoſing, at preſent, what he takes for granted, to be true; which however (as I ſhall ſhew hereafter) He ought not to have taken for granted; *Viz.* That by the *gates of Hell* is meant the ſame, as if it had been ſaid, the *Devil*: I anſwer, *Firſt*, He is guilty of a groſs Falſhood, in ſaying we have charg'd *the Church of Chriſt with being guilty of damnable Errors*; as if we allow'd the Church of *Chriſt* and the Church of *Rome* to be all one. *Secondly*, He takes it for granted, tho' it ought to have been prov'd, not ſuppos'd, that the Devil *prevails* (according to the Senſe in which our Savi-

our

our us'd the Word κατισχύειν) againſt the Church, if it be guilty of *damnable Errors*. But how does he prove that our Saviour meant ſo by the Word? To *prevail againſt* it, according to almoſt all the Commentators and Tranſlators, is to *deſtroy*, at leaſt to *conquer* it. But is it deſtroy'd, or ſo much as conquer'd, by being guilty of damnable Errors? Is a *ſingle Man* neceſſarily deſtroy'd in This World, or damn'd in the Next; becauſe he believes, and does, many *damnable things?* Can he not *repent*, and *reform*? And cannot the ſame Queſtion be ask'd of a *Church*? By the way, This Argument will as well (if not better) prove the Church to be *impeccable*, as *infallible*: For the Devil prevails by *Sin*, as much as by *Error*; or rather more. And yet that the Church is impeccable, No body affirms. If our Author proceeds upon the *Engliſh* Tranſlation only, as he ſeems to do; by *prevailing againſt* is certainly meant *conquering*: And a man, I hope, is not neceſſarily conquer'd becauſe he is much wounded. This therefore is no better than a poor *Petitio Principii*, or *Begging* the Queſtion. As 3*dly*. The next is no better than a ſorry *Ignoratio Elenchi*, or *miſtaking* the Queſtion. *If the Church of Chriſt were guilty of the damnable Errors*, &c. *the Gates of Hell would*, &c. The Queſtion is not whether the Church be ſecured from falling into

damnable Errors, but whether the Church be *Infallible?* Theſe are evidently diſtinct Things. For the Church may neither be *deſtroy'd*, nor permitted to fall into *damnable* Errors; and yet not be *Infallible*: As on the other hand, which has been before taken notice of, ſhe *may* fall into *damnable* Errors, and yet *not* be *deſtroy'd*. Had his Argument, inſtead of [*if the Church were guilty of the damnable Errors*, &c.] ran Thus; If the Church were not *infallible*, as Proteſtants *pretend* She is not, the *Gates of Hell* would have *prevail'd againſt* Her; it would have been to the Purpoſe: Tho' *4thly* altogether Inconcluſive and Abſurd. For how does it follow that becauſe a Perſon, or Number of Perſons, is not *infallible*; therefore He, or They, muſt needs be *conquer'd* and ſubdu'd by the *Devil?* According to This, All but the Pope, and Biſhops, even of the *Romiſh* Church, and They too (the Biſhops) aſſembled in a *Council*, muſt neceſſarily be damn'd. For I ſuppoſe they will not ſay that by the Church they mean the *Laity*, or that any one of *Them* is infallible, nor any of the inferior Clergy, nor the Prelates themſelves, unleſs aſſembled in a Council. It ſeems then there is not ſo very certain a Paſſage from the Church of *Rome*'s Boſom to *Abraham*'s: And 'tis ſcarce worth while to *turn Papiſt*; unleſs one were ſure to be *Pope*, or at leaſt a *Biſhop*, and to have a *general Council* always *ſubſiſting*; beſides many o-

ther

ther Difficulties which I could mention. And yet the Argument, if it be any thing to our Subject, ſtands as I ſaid: If the Church were not infallible, the Devil would have been too hard for her. The Dialogue proceeds. * *But will not Proteſtants ſay, it is not the true Church of Chriſt, but the corrupt Church of* Rome, *they accuſe of damnable Errors; and that Theſe are as different as Light, and Darkneſs?* They will be apt to ſay ſo indeed; and let us hear the Anſwer to it.

† P. *Sir, The Diſpute is preciſely concerning the Church founded by Chriſt; which They maintain to be not only fallible, but that it has effectually fallen into the damnable Errors of Popiſh Idolatry and Superſtition.* I anſwer, 1*ſt*. It is abſolutely falſe that the Diſpute is preciſely about *the Church founded by Chriſt*: 'Tis about the Church of *Rome* only; no *other* Church pretending to be Infallible: Tho' I own we, incidentally, deny that *any* Church, the univerſal Church itſelf, is ſo. 2*dly*. All the World knows that Papiſts by *the Church* mean the Church of *Rome* only; as our Author in particular all along does: And therefore upon his Principles, the Diſtinction He here makes, or rather ſeems to make, is impertinent. 3*dly*. 'Tis falſe to ſay we affirm, that *It* the (Church

* P. 26. † *Ibid.*

founded by Chriſt) has *fallen into the damnable Errors of Popiſh Idolatry and Superſtition.* All Churches, 'tis true, may have fallen into Errors: Several, beſides the *Romiſh*, actually have into grievous Ones; nay, ſome, as the *Greek* Church, into the *ſame* with many of the *Popiſh* Ones: But they have not fallen into them *as* Popiſh; becauſe they deny, firſt, the *Pope's Supremacy*; and ſecondly, the Doctrine of *Infallibility*, the Point now in Diſpute. *'Tis therefore in vain* (continues He *) *to pretend to elude the force of the above-ſaid Text, by ſaying it is not the true Church of Chriſt, but the corrupt Church of* Rome, *they accuſe of damnable Errors; and there is an unanſwerable Dilemma againſt them. For Chriſt either had a true Church upon Earth before the Reformation; or he had not. If not; then his Church was deſtroy'd; and by conſequence the Gates of Hell prevail'd againſt it, contrary to his Promiſe. But if he had a true Church upon Earth, the Church of* Rome *was moſt certainly That Church: Since, according to the large Conceſſion made in the Book of Homilies, it was in poſſeſſion of whole Chriſtendom for many Ages before the Reformation. And if that Church was in all that ſpace of Time guilty of abominable Ido-*

* P. 26. and 27.

latry

latry, as is pretended; then the true Church of Chriſt was guilty of it; And ſo what Part ſoever of the Dilemma Proteſtants chuſe, they charge Chriſt with a Breach of Promiſe in ſuffering the Gates of Hell to prevail againſt his Church: God forbid we ſhould thus *charge God fooliſhly:* And the beſt of it is, we are not bound to ſtand or fall by your *Dictates:* We ſhould be in a wretched Condition indeed, if we were. To avoid the danger of This horrid Blaſphemy, I chuſe the latter Part of the Dilemma; and ſay, our Saviour, before the Reformation, *had* a true Church upon Earth: Of which the Church of *Rome* was a *true*, tho' a moſt *corrupt*, Part. I ſay *Part*: For to his Argument, by which, upon our pretended Conceſſion, he endeavours to prove that it was the Whole, I anſwer: *1ſt.* The Homily ſays, I grant, that *whole Chriſtendom was drowned in Idolatry*: But does That make *whole Chriſtendom* the Church of *Rome*? Would That Church engroſs all the Idolatry of the World to Her ſelf? 'Tis true all thorough Papiſts are Idolaters; but all Idolaters are not Papiſts. Nay, *Image-worſhip* (of which *alone* the Homily ſpeaks) began, as every Body knows, in the *Greek* Church, not in the Church of *Rome*. Yet Thus ſtands This Argument: *The Church of* Rome *was moſt certainly That Church; ſince according to the large Conceſſion made in the*

Book of Homilies, IT *was in poſſeſſion of whole Chriſtendom for many Ages, before the Reformation.* The Church of *Rome*, it ſeems, is not only *Idolatrous*, but *Idolatry* it ſelf. For becauſe the Homily ſays *Idolatry was in poſſeſſion*, &c. This Writer infers that it ſays the *Church* of *Rome* was ſo. 2*dly*. All the Churches upon Earth (or, if You pleaſe, the Church univerſal) may be guilty of *Idolatry* it ſelf; and yet not be *deſtroyed*, or quite conquer'd by the Devil, nor the *Gates of Hell* entirely *prevail againſt her*. God own'd the Church of the *Jews*, as *his* Church; when it was over-run with Idolatry, and all other Corruptions.

I have hitherto been reaſoning upon *Suppoſition*, that *our Author's Suppoſition is true*; *viz.* that by the *Gates of Hell* is meant the *Power of the Devil*: And even upon That foot have ſhewn the wretched Abſurdity of his Arguing. But what if after all it ſhould mean no ſuch Thing? As 'tis evident, almoſt to a Demonſtration, it does *not*: Then all he ſays about damnable Errors *&c.* and indeed the whole Streſs of his Argument will be yet more roving and extravagant. The word Ἅδης, here render'd *Hell*, is not the Place of the *Damned* (Γέεννα is the Name for That) but the *Grave*, or the *Place* of *departed* Souls: For ſometimes it ſignifies the One, and ſometimes the Other. The beſt Senſe of the Paſſage therefore is this: The Church

ſhall

ſhall continue to the *World's End*, notwithſtanding the *Perſecutions* and *violent Deaths* of the *Apoſtles*, and multitudes of the *firſt* Chriſtians, and the *Mortality* of its *Teachers* and *Governours* in *all Ages*. This, I own, is an Argument for the *Perpetuity* or Indefectibility of the Church in general, not That of *Rome* in particular; But what it has to do with Infallibility I cannot imagine: Unleſs they will argue that Perpetuity *infers* Infallibility. If they do; let the Argument be produced, and I am ready to anſwer it. Another Interpretation has been put upon This Text; which, it being immaterial to the preſent Debate, I need not mention. But be the Meaning of it what it will; any Body of common Reaſon may ſee what is *not* the Meaning of it. One may as well ſqueeze Water out of a Pumice, as the Church of *Rome*'s Infallibility out of Theſe Words: *Thou art Peter; and upon this Rock I will build my Church; and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* In ſhort, the Caſe ſtands Thus: Our Saviour ſaid He would always have a Church upon Earth; againſt which all the Power and Malice of Men, Devils, and Death, ſhould not prevail; Therefore the Church of *Rome* is Infallible. *Quod erat Demonſtrandum.* Was there ever ſuch * *clear* and *ſtrong* Reaſoning? Who,

* *P.* 25.

without torturing This Text *in the most unmerciful manner, or reading it backwards, can discover any thing in it but the Church's perpetual Infallibility?*

P. 27. 2dly. *Christ's Promise to his Apostles of* abiding with them always even unto the end of the World. Matth. 28. *v.* 20. *establishes the Church's perpetual Infallibility as fully, and clearly, as the other.* Just *as fully and clearly*, I confess. Our Author might have spared his learned Confutation of the Opinion of Those, who confine This promise to the three or four first Ages: For I know No body that ever so confin'd it. Or if there be any such; I agree with Him that they are in the wrong. But then He himself is so, in saying that it *comprehended equally* the *Successors* of the Apostles with the *Apostles themselves*: For sure it *chiefly* and *principally* regarded the last mentioned. Our Saviour was *more* with Them, than with any of their Successors. All He farther says worth our notice is This. * *If therefore Christ has kept his Word, which no Man can deny without Blasphemy; one of these two things must be granted, to wit, that either he promis'd to remain with Idolaters in order to be their Guide even unto*

* P. 27, 28.

the

the end of the World (*and that is moſt highly abſurd*) *or that his Church by being in all Ages under the promiſed Direction, and Aſſiſtance of her heavenly Guide, has always continued untainted in her Faith, and will continue ſo to the World's End.* To which I anſwer. 1*ſt*. Here is the ſame ſort of Blunder as before, in miſtaking the Queſtion: The Church may *continue untainted in her Faith to the World's End*, without being *Infallible*. Suppoſe a *ſingle Man* never to have fallen into any one *Error*, or committed any one grievous *Sin* all his Days; Was He therefore *Infallible*? an *Infallible Judge* of all Controverſies? *&c.* Which ſuggeſts to us 2*dly*. that This Argument, like the former, will as well prove the Church's *Impeccability*, as *Infallibility*. 3*dly*. This too, like That, is an Argument for the Church's *Perpetuity*, not *Infallibility*. I ſpeak of the Church *in general*; for as to the Church of *Rome*, our Saviour never ſaid one Word about it. But 4*thly*. To come cloſer to our Author's Reaſoning: I deny the *Diſjunction*. For Chriſt may be with his Church to the World's End; and yet *neither* have promis'd to remain *with Idolaters* &c. *nor* his Church have always continued *untainted in her Faith*, and ſo always continue. The *Medium* is (One, I mean, for I ſhall afterwards aſſign Another) his not ſuffering his Church *totally to fail*, or ceaſe to be a true Church. This

Writer

Writer never enquires into the *Sense* of the Words *am with You*, upon which *All* turns; but, according to his usual compendious way of Begging the Question, takes it for *granted* that his *own Arbitrary* Interpretation is the only *true* one. 2*dly*. Christ may, without any such mighty Absurdity, be with even *Idolaters*, in order to be their Guide and Teacher, tho' not *as* Idolaters; (He was so with the *Jews*, as we have seen before) and have promised to *be with* his Church *to the end of the World*, tho' it should in *some places*, and at *some times*, or even for *some time* in *all* places, *more*, or *less*, be *Idolatrous*. For besides that He might have thousands of true Worshippers among the false ones, as it happened in *Elijah's* time; *Idolatry* it self does not *destroy* the Church: As we have above [observed.

But what if, after all, the Text should mean no more than This, as it very well may not, that Christ will *tender* his *Grace* and *Assistance* to the Church 'till the World's End? Must the Church therefore be *Infallible*? May it not on the contrary be *overrun* with all manner of *Errors* in Faith, and *Vice* in Practice? God's *Grace* is *promised* to *all Christians*; yet Millions *reject* it, and *quench* his *Spirit*. In like manner, Christ has promis'd to *be with* his *Ministers* in matters of Faith; and yet Those Ministers

ters may reject his tender'd Influence, through Self-views, Ignorance, or Prejudice. While a Liberty of Choice is left in Men; any Aſſiſtance, That of God himſelf, may be rejected. The Sum of This clear and ſtrong Argument, the Light of which we cannot reſiſt without moſt *unmercifully torturing the Scriptures*, or *reading them backwards*, amounts to Thus much: Our Saviour promis'd to *be with*, *i. e.* to *aſſiſt*, chiefly his *Apoſtles*, and in ſome meaſure his *Church* in *general*, to the World's End, without the leaſt Hint about the Church of *Rome*; Therefore the Church of *Rome* is Infallible. The Argument muſt needs be *unanſwerable*; becauſe there is not a Syllable in the *Premiſes* of what is contained in the *Concluſion*. The Concluſion joins *Infallibility* to the Church of *Rome*; whereas in the Premiſes there is no Mention either of the Church of *Rome*, or *Infallibility*.

P. 28. 3dly. *The Church's Charter of perpetual Infallibility is confirm'd to her by our Saviour's Promiſe of ſending the Holy Ghoſt, not only to the Apoſtles, but to all their Succeſſors.* I will pray my Father, and He ſhall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you FOR EVER; the Spirit of Truth. *John* 14. *v.* 16, 17. *But to what end was he to abide with them for ever? Let us hear Chriſt himſelf anſwer the Queſtion.* When the Spirit of Truth comes; he will guide you into all Truth.

Truth. *John* 16. *v.* 13. *And again.* The Holy Ghoſt, whom the Father will ſend in my Name, will teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance which I have ſaid unto you. *John* 14. *v.* 26. Our Author, it ſeems, takes This Proof of the Church's Infallibility to be *ſelf-evident*; for he ſays nothing to *enforce* it. And the young Gentleman being without any more adoe convinc'd by the irreſiſtible force of This Argument, as well as of the Others, immediately anſwers; *Really, Sir, I am aſtoniſh'd*, &c. as I ſhall preſently cite the whole Paſſage. Nevertheleſs; I ſhall add a few Words by way of Anſwer, tho' 'tis more than I am oblig'd to: I having as good a Right to ſay, without any Proof, that theſe Texts are *not* to the Purpoſe; as He had to quote them, without any Proof that they *are*. Among many other Anſwers then which might be given; the ſame may be apply'd to the *firſt* of Theſe Texts, which was given to the Argument from the *foregoing* one. *The Spirit of Truth may abide for ever* with the Teachers of the Goſpel, ſo as to *tender* his Grace and Aſſiſtance to them; and yet they may *reſiſt* his Motions, and ſo have no Benefit from ſuch his *abiding with them. Know Ye not*, (ſays St. *Paul*) *that Your Bodies are Temples of the Holy Ghoſt?* 1 Cor. 6. 19. And yet He warns the *Corinthians* to *flee Fornication*, and not to *ſin againſt their*

own

own Bodies. So that the *Abiding of the Holy Ghoſt* in the Temples of their Bodies, was no Argument that they muſt neceſſarily be always *unpolluted:* And as little is his *Abiding with the Church* an Argument of its always being *in the Right*, much leſs of its being *always*, or *ever*, *Infallible.* The two other Texts ſubjoined to This, out of the ſame Diſcourſe of our Saviour, plainly relate in their *primary* and *principal* Senſe, *at leaſt*, to the *Perſons* of the *Apoſtles*; and all three of them *may at leaſt*, which is ſufficient to our preſent purpoſe, relate to Them *only.* For the Word *for ever*, as all the World knows, is in Scripture, in all Writings, and in common Diſcourſe, often us'd in a *reſtrain'd* Signification; according to the *Subject* to which it is apply'd: Nay conſidering the *Time*, and *Occaſion*, of our Saviour's Diſcourſe, there is *little leſs* than *Demonſtration* that they *do* relate to Them *only.* However to put it at the loweſt, here is nothing about the Church of *Rome* in particular: Or if it were otherwiſe; To be *guided into all Truth*, does not imply that the *Guidance* muſt *of neceſſity* be effectually *followed*; nor does being *taught* all things, or having one's *Memory refreſh'd*, imply *Infallibility.* For a man may be not only *inſtructed* in, but very *learned* in, all Languages, all Arts and Sciences, all Points of

of Morality and Divinity, without being *abſolute Maſter* of *all* the *Truths* contain'd in them, or any thing like *Infallible*. I ſhall be a little more particular in ſumming up the Subſtance of the Argument from Theſe Texts, upon the two *different Suppoſitions* concerning the *Senſe* of them. Suppoſing our Saviour to ſpeak this of the *Apoſtles only*, as 'tis ten thouſand to one but He did; (yet I deny not but the *Aſſiſtance* of his Holy Spirit, tho' not *Infallibility*, is in other places, whether it be here or no, promis'd to his Church in general through *all Ages*) then the Argument ſtands Thus. Our Saviour, being juſt ready to leave the World, comforts his Apoſtles, who upon That account were in great Trouble and Perplexity, with the Promiſe of the *Holy Ghoſt*; who ſhould not, as *He* had done, continue with them for a *little while*, but *for ever*; during their *whole Lives*; ſhould *guide them into all Truth, teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance*: Therefore the Church of *Rome* is Infallible. If we interpret the Paſſage as relating to the *Apoſtles* and their *Succeſſors* in Conjunction, (though certainly we cannot interpret it *equally* of Both; for then I cannot conceive what Superiority or Preheminence the Apoſtles would have over their Succeſſors; and in reality 'tis ſcarce common Senſe to interpret it of the Latter

at

at all:) then we ſhall have it Thus. Our Saviour promis'd, that the Holy Ghoſt ſhould *abide with*, i. e. aſſiſt, not only the Apoſtles, but the Miniſters of the Church (not a word about That of *Rome* in particular) to the World's End; teach them, and remind them of all Things, (neceſſary to their Salvation; for ſure He ſpeaks of nothing elſe) tho' Thoſe, who are ſo *taught* and *reminded* may neither *learn*, nor *remember*, as they ſhould do: Therefore the Church of *Rome* is Infallible. Q. E. D. How *unmercifully muſt We torture* Theſe Texts, or *read them backwards*, not to *diſcover in them the perpetual Infallibility* aforeſaid!

I might here very well conclude my Anſwer to This Section; all the *Argumentation* being over. But the *Confidence* and *Inſolence* which ſucceeds it, is ſo *ridiculous*, (and, being ſo, it is to me not in the leaſt *provoking*) that contrary to my Deſign, and almoſt Promiſe, in the Beginning, I cannot forbear diverting my Reader with it. A famous Critick tells us, that the *Height of Impudence is perfectly Comical.* I am of his Mind; It moves Laughter, rather than Indignation. Can any thing be more whimſically extravagant, than for a Man to *introduce* ſuch Arguments as have not the leaſt Shadow of Reaſon in them, with ſuch *formal Preparation*, and *bluſtring Language*, as I have above recited; and *after* having produced

produced them, to triumph, and plume himself, as if he had made a Demonstration as plain, as any in *Euclide*; then to *add* a *long Speech* against *Prejudice* and *Self-Interest*, *calumniating* and *vilifying* his Adversaries, as if they had not *common Honesty*, for not believing against *common Sense*? You shall have it all at length in his own Words: And I need be at no further Trouble; For to *transcribe* it, is to *answer* it.

* G. *Really, Sir, I am astonish'd that Persons who* PRETEND *to believe that the Scriptures are divinely inspir'd, and contain the pure Word of God; nay and* PROFESS *to make them the only Rule of their Faith* (*as you have often told me*) *can read these repeated Promises express'd in Terms so* STRONG *and* CLEAR, *so* OBVIOUS, *and* EASY, *that even the most ordinary Capacities cannot well mistake their meaning, without* STUDYING TO DECEIVE THEMSELVES; *yet at the same time have the* CONFIDENCE *to oppose the Doctrine, thus* PLAINLY *asserted by them, with the same* POSITIVENESS, *and* OBSTINACY, *as if they had the* ALCORAN, *instead of the* WORD OF GOD *before them.* The Pupil, 'tis to be hop'd, has done his Part. And what says the Tutor?

---

* 28, 29.

P. *Sir,*

P. *Sir, You have all the Reaſon in the World to be aſtoniſh'd at it: And I verily believe, that if a Friend ſhould leave to any Proteſtant a conſiderable Legacy, or ſettle an Eſtate upon him and his Heirs for ever, in Terms as ſtrong and clear as our bleſſed Saviour, by his laſt Will and Teſtament, bequeath'd to his Church the divine Legacy of his perpetual Direction and Aſſiſtance; he would be clear-ſighted enough to underſtand the true Meaning of it; there would be no need of any Perſuaſive Arguments, or Reaſons, to convince him of the Juſtice of his Title.* If by *perpetual Direction and Aſſiſtance* He means ſuch as beſtows *Infallibility*, as He *muſt* if He means any thing to the *purpoſe*; I profeſs ſincerely, I would not give a ſingle Farthing for an Eſtate of Ten thouſand a Year, upon no better a Title. The *Will* would *Infallibly* be ſet aſide in *Chancery*; ſhould I be Fool enough to ſtand a Suit there: And I ſhould not only loſe my Cauſe, and my Money in proſecuting it, but be laugh'd at into the bargain. He goes on. *But alas to a Perſon whoſe Heart is* INSINCERE, *and* BIASS'D BY AN INTEREST IRRECONCILEABLE WITH THE GOSPEL, *to ſuch a one, I ſay, the Word of God is a Seed that falls upon barren Ground, and remains without Fruit. The very* CLEAREST LIGHT *is Darkneſs to him; and he can extract Falſhood*

out of Truth itſelf, when it chimes not with his INTEREST.

G. *'Tis very certain that whoever has his Heart ſtrongly ſet upon any worldly* INTEREST *ſees every thing through falſe Glaſſes. For it leſſens or magnifies Things, and makes them appear beautiful, or deform'd, right or wrong, true, or falſe, juſt as they flatter, or thwart that* INTEREST. *And we may with almoſt as much Hopes of Succeſs, undertake to calm a Storm, or ſilence a Hurricane with* DEMONSTRATIONS, *as make a Man yield to* REASON *againſt an* INTEREST *that lies near his Heart. Nay I have known Perſons as ſharp-ſighted in their* TEMPORAL CONCERNS *as the cunningeſt Sophiſters upon Earth; yet at the ſame time as dull, and blind as Beetles, in all matters relating to the Concerns of* ANOTHER WORLD. *So true is it, that* INTEREST *both opens, and ſhuts Men's Eyes; according as the Objects that preſent themſelves, are agreeable, or diſagreeable to it.* I have ſet down This curious Paſſage at large; to ſhew Theſe Gentlemen that we are not *afraid* of it: And alſo to give the Reader a *Sample* of This *Reaſoning*; which our Author makes great uſe of, frequently repeating it in his Book. How often ſoever it occurs, I ſhall take no notice of it hereafter; having here *anſwer'd* it *once for all*, i. e. *tranſcrib'd* it. That Men, who are ſuch *Slaves* to Prejudice and Self-Intereſt,

as

as to believe, or profeſs that they believe, contrary not only to the plaineſt *Reaſon* and *Scripture*, but to their *Senſes*, that ſuch I ſay, ſhould accuſe *Us* of Prejudice and Self-Intereſt, for not aſſenting to ſo groſs an Abſurdity, as the *Romiſh* Infallibility, upon the Evidence of Arguments as abſurd as it ſelf, would really be very ſurprizing; were we not acquainted with the Modeſty of Popiſh Writers. They might conſider, however, that *We* could make Theſe Declamations upon *Them*, as well as *They* upon *Us*; were we idle, and impertinent enough, to do ſo. But we ſcorn it; and only remind our *weaker* Readers, that there is no *Argument* in all This *Outcry*; which is only contrived to amuſe and confound their Underſtandings: And that the *Clamours* of our Adverſaries are, like their *Reaſonings*, mere Cobweb-Snares; which as None but *poyſonous Inſects* will weave, ſo None but *light*, and *ſilly* ones will be catch'd by.

To the Fifth SECTION;

ENTITULED,

The Church's perpetual Indefectibility, and Infallibility, prov'd from the ninth Article of the Creed.

THE Young Gentleman, in the last Words of the Last Section, having ask'd why the *Church's Infallibility*, since it is so *important* a Point, *has not a place in the Apostles' Creed*, is answer'd by his Preceptor at the Beginning of This; that many *other* Doctrines of *great Importance* are *not in the Creed*; but it does not follow, that therefore they *are not to be believed*. This I grant; but then by his Leave, their Church's *Infallibility* is an Article of such *infinite Moment* and Consequence (all the rest, in truth, depending upon This) that, if there be any such Thing, I cannot imagine how it comes to pass that we find not These Words in the Creed; *I believe the Church of* Rome *to be Infallible*. But the real Reason of it is This; There is nothing in the *Creed*, but what is in the *Scriptures*.

This Article, however, if we will take his word, is vertually in the Creed; and so are all

all other Popiſh Tenets. * *Becauſe, believing the Church implies Believing her whole Doctrine.* To which I anſwer, and 'tis Anſwer ſufficient, that We may believe the *Holy Catholick Church*, without believing *all the Church of* Rome *ſays:* Becauſe 1*ſt.* 'tis one thing to believe *there is* a Holy Catholick Church, which is all This Article means; and another, to believe that whatever *She ſays* is certainly *true.* 2*dly.* The Church of *Rome* is not the *Catholick* Church. Nor 3*dly.* is the *whole Doctrine* of the Church of *Rome agreeable* to the Doctrine of the *Catholick* Church.

Tho' This Creed was certainly not compos'd by the Apoſtles, whatever † St. *Leo &c.* have ſaid of it; yet our Author need not ſo ‖ *formally have prov'd* from the Eighth of our Thirty nine Articles, that We *receive* it as *agreeable to Scripture*; ſo that we have pinn'd our ſelves down, and cannot *deny* the Authority of it, *after* He ſhall have irrefragably *prov'd* the Church's *Infallibility* from it: Which is I believe, ſuch a mixture of Abſurdity, and Confidence, as is not eaſily to be match'd. I wonder He did not, *mutatis mutandis*, preface his unanſwerable Arguments from *Scripture*

* *P.* 30. † *Ibid.* ‖ *P.* 30, 31.

in the same solemn Words. * *But I desire you to take notice, that, according to their* Sixth *and* Seventh *Articles of Religion, the* Scriptures *cannot be false*; 1st. *Because* &c. 2dly. *Because* &c *Now surely no falsehood* &c. *Nor can the Contradictory* &c. This Foppery is so silly on the one hand, and so saucy on the other; that it deserves much worse Words than I have given it, and ought not only to be *detected*, but *exploded*. His *Arguments* from the *Creed*, We are to understand, will be so *Demonstrative*; that We of the Church of *England* shall have no Resource, no Way to come off, but *denying the Authority* of it: Whereas they are just as Demonstrative, as Those from *Scripture* in the foregoing Section, which we have fully considered; *i. e.* not in the least to the Purpose, the Premises having no manner of Relation to the Conclusion. They are all reducible to This: There is *one Holy, Catholick, Apostolick Church*, and a *Communion of Saints*; Therefore the *Church of* Rome *is Infallible*.

In order to turn our own weapons against us, He is pleas'd to give us a long Quotation from Bishop *Pearson*. † *His Words*, says He, *as far as relating to my Subject, are These.*

---

* P. 31. † P. 31.

If

If He had cited nothing but what *related to his Subject*, He had cited nothing at all; for He might as well have tranſcribed the whole Book, as what He has tranſcribed. Yet, ſays the Young Gentleman, * *It really appears to me, that if the Church of* Rome *had given this Proteſtant Biſhop a Fee to plead her Cauſe, he could not have done it more effectually. And it puts me in mind of this celebrated Maxim*, magna eſt veritas, et prævalet. *The Force of Truth is great; and triumphs over Fallhood, even by the Judgment of its Enemies.* One would think Biſhop *Pearſon* in the Paſſage quoted had either *in Terms* given up the Cauſe; or at leaſt laid down ſuch *Poſitions*, that *one* ſingle *Deduction* from them muſt *Demonſtrate* the Church of *Rome's* Infallibility. Whereas he ſays not one Word about the Church of *Rome*, or *Infallibility*: And as for the *Concluſion*, which may be drawn from His *Principles*; He ſays the Church of Chriſt is *One*, *Holy*, and *Catholick*, and will *continue* to the *end of the World*: Is the Church of *Rome* therefore Infallible? Yes; if We believe This Writer; who, after ſome Trifling not worth our notice, † and confounding a *True* Church with an *Orthodox* one, which I

* 34. † *P.* 34.

have shewn to be very different Ideas, has these Words. * *But what are the essential, and unchangeable Properties of this Church, according to the same Creed? They consist in her being One, Holy, Apostolical, and the Communion of Saints. Now this is an unanswerable Proof, both of Her Indefectibility, and Infallibility.* Answ. *Indefectibility* We have nothing to do with at present. Bishop *Pearson* I grant, asserts it, nor do I deny it: Tho', by the way, it does not *follow* from the Church's being *One*, *Holy*, *Apostolick*, and the *Communion of Saints*, that *therefore* it is *Indefectible*. Neither is the Word *Apostolick* in This Creed; tho' it be in Another, which we equally receive. Instead of *Apostolick*, I should have said *Catholick*; which *is* in This Creed, and which our Author *omits*. I might add moreover, that to be the *Communion of Saints*, tho' it is made a Part of the 9th Article, is not an *Affection* of the *Church*, as *Unity*, *Holiness*, and *Catholicism* are; nor does Bishop *Pearson* make it so; nor can *good Sense* be made of it. But not to insist upon these Niceties; let us take it as it stands, and consider the force of this Argument. But before we can do so, We are interrupted by an Enquiry; † *what is the Difference between the Church's Inde-*

---

* P. 34. † P. 35.

fectibility

fectibility and Infallibility? I thought the Young Gentleman had underſtood *Latin*; and if ſo, one would wonder he ſhould ask ſo idle a Queſtion. But 'tis not for nothing, we muſt think, that he is made to ask it: 'Tis to introduce the uſual Piece of Sophiſtry which a Papiſt cannot live without, *Confounding* the Church *Catholick* with the Church of *Rome*. * *Sir, by the former is meant, that* SHE *never will periſh*, &c. *In like manner if* SHE *ſhould teach Doctrines oppoſite to the Faith* &c. As to the 1ſt. 'Tis *true*, that *She*, the *Catholick* Church, will *never periſh*; but the Church of *Rome* may. As to the 2d. 'Tis *falſe*, that *She*, the Church of *Rome*, *cannot teach Doctrines oppoſite to the true Faith.* The Words *Viſible* and *Inviſible*, as apply'd to the *Church*, are here brought in again; But That matter ſhall be conſidered once for all, in our Examination of the *Fourth* Dialogue. At preſent our Author tells us, that if the Church *ſhould* † *impoſe abominable Errors, ſuch as Idolatry and Superſtitions, upon the Faithful, and demand of them Terms of Communion, which are inconſiſtent with Salvation; She would moſt certainly ceaſe to be an unerring Guide.* To which I add; BUT

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

the

the Church of *Rome* long *has* impos'd, and ſtill *does* impoſe, *abominable Errors* &c. and *Terms of Communion inconſiſtent with Salvation*; (I mean in their *Nature* and *Tendency*, however God may have *Mercy* upon Thoſe, who *ignorantly* embrace them :) Therefore The Church of *Rome ceaſes to be an unerring Guide*, if ever ſhe *were* ſo. The Argument is plain. The *Major* is his own ; and the *Minor* is prov'd from their Worſhip of Images, and Reliques, Saints, and Angels ; Communion in one Kind ; Purgatory ; their Doctrine of Attrition ; *Opus Operatum* ; and many other Corruptions. And, indeed, it is much clearer and ſtronger Reaſoning to argue Thus ; The Church of *Rome* actually errs, therefore She is not Infallible : Than Thus ; the Church of *Rome* is Infallible, therefore She cannot err. Of which more hereafter. The pretended *Promiſes of God*, * upon which the Church's Infallibility is ſaid to be founded, I have proved to be no ſuch Promiſes ; and ſo what is here alledg'd upon that Head, of courſe, falls to the Ground.

But now for the unanſwerable Argument ; proving the Church's Infallibility, from Her being One, Holy, Apoſtolick, and the Com-

* *P.* 36.

munion

munion of Saints. * *If She ſhould either fail entirely, or ceaſe to be either One, or Holy, or Apoſtolical, or the Communion of Saints; the ninth Article of the Creed would then be falſe: And whoſoever ſhould at that time ſay it, would utter a downright Lye, in making Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith. Anſw.* Tho' the Church ſhould *fail*, This Article would not be falſe; becauſe *Indefectibility* is not aſſerted in it. *Unity* is eſſential to every Being; ſo that as long as the Church is *at all*, She is certainly One. *Holy*, and *Apoſtolick*, She will likewiſe always be in *ſome* Senſe or *other*, as long as She is *at all*: And She will be the *Communion of Saints* too, as long as She *continues*, if by That be meant the ſame as Her being *Holy*; Otherwiſe, I take Her being the Communion of Saints not to be Senſe. A Communion of Saints, indeed, there is and ever will be; but 'tis abſurd to ſay the Church is That Communion. Doubtleſs, whoever ſhall by profeſſing the Faith of the Creed, ſay, there *is* a Holy Catholick Church, when at the ſame time there is *none*, will utter a downright *Falſhood*; Falſhood, I ſay; for it may not be a *Lye*: But I conceive there is no Danger of it; becauſe if the

* *Ibid.*

Church

Church ſhould be loſt, I imagine the Profeſſion of That Faith would be loſt too. * *But ſince it is manifeſt Blaſphemy to ſay, that the Creed, which may be proved by moſt certain Warrant of Holy Scripture, can ever be falſe, or that a Perſon can be guilty of Lying in profeſſing the Chriſtian Doctrine taught by the Apoſtles; it follows, that the above-ſaid ninth Article of the Creed contains a demonſtrative Proof, that the Church of Chriſt has always been, and will always be, an unerring Guide; that is, Infallible in all her Deciſions of Faith.* I deny the Conſequence. It does not follow, that becauſe the Church is One, Holy, Apoſtolical, and the Communion of Saints, add Indefectible, if You pleaſe, tho' that is not in the Article; therefore She ever was, is, will be, or can be, Infallible. This is ſo far from being a *Demonſtrative* Proof; that it has not the leaſt Shadow of *any* Proof. Our Author will preſently endeavour to reinforce his Argument; and then I ſhall more fully ſhew the Weakneſs of it. † *And that by Conſequence, She never was guilty of the abominable Errors laid to her Charge by her rebellious Children.* Beyond Controverſy, if She was Infallible; She could not

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

be

be guilty of abominable Errors. But then *She*, not only the Church of *Rome*, but *any Church*, was never Infallible. And *She*, the Church of *Rome*, has been guilty of *abominable*, nay damnable, *Errors*; and therefore her *Children* were not *rebellious* in rejecting them. * *That the Creed in the ſuppoſed Caſe would be falſe, is manifeſt to common Senſe; becauſe if the Church really fell into the damnable Eorors*, &c. Here is the old Blunder, ſo often repeated in the foregoing Section. The Church may *not fall* into *damnable Errors*; and yet *not* be *Infallible*: And whether She be Infallible or not, is the only Queſtion. Our Author's Argument therefore ſhould not have ran Thus, *If the Church really fell into damnable Errors*; but Thus, *If the Church* were not Infallible: † *How can it be ſaid; that She was then either One, or Holy, or Apoſtolical, or the Communion of Saints?* However, I will take it juſt as it ſtands; and if we ſhew that the Church, even the Church in general, not to mention That of *Rome* in particular, may continue to be *One*, *Holy*, &c. and yet not only be capable of falling, but actually fall, into *damnable Errors*; underſtanding by *damnable, tending* in their *own nature* to the

---

* *P.* 37. † *Ibid.*

Damnation

Damnation of Thoſe who hold them, not *neceſſarily cauſing* their Damnation; It will follow *a fortiori*; that She may be *One*, *Holy*, &c. and yet not be *Infallible*. * *This*, ſays our Author, *viz.* [that the Church ſhould be *One*, *Holy*, &c. and yet fall into *damnable Errors*,] *implies a manifeſt Contradiction. For in the firſt place, She would then moſt certainly have forfeited her Unity, by falling from her former Faith.* If She *wholly* fell from her former Faith; She would, indeed, forfeit her *Unity*: Becauſe She would forfeit Her *Being*; juſt as a Man forfeits his Life, by dying of any *Diſtemper*. But She might fall into damnable Errors, and yet not wholly fall from Her former Faith: Nay, She might retain *all* Her former Faith, and yet hold damnable Errors in *conjunction* with it. For, tho' ſuch Errors are in reality repugnant to ſome Particulars of the true Faith, yet She may not be ſenſible of it; Conſequences may really follow from Her Doctrine, which She ſees not, but rejects and abhors. † *For can a Church that changes her Faith be properly call'd one, and the ſame?* Yes; if *changing Her Faith* means *falling into damnable Errors*; as it muſt mean, if it means any thing

---

* P. *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

to

to the *preſent* Point; tho' even That is nothing to the *main* Point, which is the *Infallibility* of the Church. I ſay, She may fall into damnable Errors; and yet be one and the ſame Church. Cannot one and the ſame Man, and it holds as well of a Community, be in perfect Health at one time, and very ſick at another? * *On the contrary, inſtead of continuing what ſhe was by her divine Eſtabliſhment*, viz. *the True, and only Orthodox Church of Chriſt* —— She may be *True*, and not *Orthodox*; as before obſerved: She may hold damnable Errors; and yet be a *True* Church in *one* Senſe, tho' not *Orthodox*. † *She would have become an Heretical Communion, and the very Synagogue of Satan.* 1ſt. All *Errors*, even damnable ones, are not *Hereſies*. 2*dly*. She might hold ſome *Hereſies*, and yet not be *quite* the *Synagogue of Satan*. Or 3*dly*. She might be ſo in *ſome* Reſpects, and not in *others*. 4*thly*. If by being the *Synagogue of Satan*, be meant being *extremely corrupt*; She may be even *That*, and ſtill be *one*, and *true*, in the Senſe above-mentioned; I add, *good*, metaphyſically, tho' not morally. ‡ *Nay, a ſource of Diviſions, and Author of Schiſm.* So that whatever Church holds

---

*Ibid. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid.

damnable

damnable Errors, is the *Author of Schism*: But the Church of *Rome* holds damnable Errors: *Ergo, &c.* The Schism therefore, with regard to the Separation between Them and Us, is Theirs, not Ours. * *In as much as her own Children would then have been bound to separate themselves from Her.* Not from *Her*, but from Her *Errors*: But however, be That as it will; She, not They, would be answerable for the Separation, according to our Author's own Concession. † Nor could *She then be Holy; unless Idolatry, or other gross Errors, be a holy Doctrine.* She might then be Holy in *some* respects; tho' not near *so* Holy, as She *should* be: Holy, in the *Faith* which She might still retain; Holy, with respect to her *Vocation*, the Original *End* of Her *Institution*, &c. Let me have Leave to quote a Passage out of Bishop *Pearson* upon This very Article; which our Author seems to have overlooked. ‡ *I conclude therefore, as the antient Catholicks did against the Donatists, that within the Church, in the publick Profession, and external Communion thereof, are contain'd Persons truly good, and sanctify'd, and hereafter sav'd; and, together with them, other Persons, void of all saving Grace, and here-*

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‡ Exposition of the Creed. *P.* 344.

after

after to be damn'd: *And that the Church containing Theſe of both Kinds, may well be call'd* Holy, *as* St. Matthew *call'd Jeruſalem, the* holy City, *even at that time, when our Saviour did but begin to preach, when we know there was in That City a general Corruption in Manners and Worſhip.* The Church then, even holding damnable Errors, may in this Senſe be Holy; and yet *Idolatry*, and other *groſs Errors*, not be *Holy Doctrines*. He adds, *Nor Apoſtolical*; *becauſe the Apoſtles never taught Idolatry, nor any damnable Errors*. The Anſwer is the ſame, as before; She might be Apoſtolical, as well as Holy, in ſome reſpects, tho' not in others. *Nor finally*, concludes he, *the Communion of Saints*; *becauſe They cannot be Saints, who communicate with an Idolatrous Church*. 1ſt. It is not ſaid, that She is the Communion of Saints; nor is it Senſe to ſay ſo. 2*dly*. Thoſe who communicate with an Idolatrous Church, in her Idolatry, or any other groſs Errors, aſſuredly are not Saints, nor tolerably good Chriſtians; at leaſt *as* ſo communicating: But doing it ignorantly, they may be good in other reſpects. 3*dly*. The *Church* may be Idolatrous, and yet *many* of her Members refuſe to communicate with Her in her Idolatry, or any other Corruptions: And *They* may be the *Saints* here on Earth; *holding Communion*, in ſome meaſure, even with the corrupt Church, tho' chiefly with

One another, with the Saints in Heaven, and with God himſelf. In ſhort, the whole Church may be overſpread with Corruptions, even with Idolatry, and yet not loſe its Being; as the Jewiſh Church did not, when it was ſo overſpread: And to ſay that it is One, Holy, Catholick, and Apoſtolical, ſo far as in the Senſe in which I have explained it, and no farther, amounts to no more than to ſay, that It is *in Being*, and that *Theſe Properties* are *eſſential* to it. Neither is it neceſſary that the Creed ſhould intend any more, nor has our Author prov'd that it does; but on the contrary, His Arguments, as I have ſhewn, are utterly groundleſs and inconcluſive.

But ſtay, not too faſt; Here is more to come.

* G. *Sir, If I have a true Underſtanding of your meaning; the Subſtance of what you have ſaid may be ſumm'd up in this ſhort Syllogiſm. If the Church, which in the Creed we profeſs to be One, Holy, Apoſtolical,* &c. *ſhould ever fall into any Errors, deſtructive to the ſaving Faith, at firſt deliver'd to the Saints; then the Creed would be falſe: But the Creed cannot be falſe; therefore ſhe can never fall into any ſuch Errors. And is,* BY

Ibid.

CON-

CONSEQUENCE, *infallible in* ALL *her Deciſions of Faith.*

P. *You have taken my Meaning very exactly; and I dare preſume to ſay, the Argument is concluſive againſt all ſuch as pretend to believe the Creed.* Tho' the Preceptor expreſſes himſelf ſtrangely; yet, waving Criticiſm, I anſwer to the *Major*: 1ſt. If by *deſtructive to*, be meant *actually deſtroying*; even then the *Sequel* is not true. For, tho' I doubt not but the Church is *Indefectible*, yet the *Creed* does not *aſſert* it; nor does it *follow* that becauſe, *while* She is *at all*, She is One, Holy, Apoſtolical, *&c.* therefore She muſt continue *for ever*. 2*dly*. If by thoſe Words be meant *directly tending to deſtroy*, *repugnant to*, and the like; much leſs is the *Sequel* true. For, as I have ſhewn, the Church may be One, Holy, *&c.* and continue ſo for ever; and yet fall into Errors, in this laſt Senſe, *deſtructive* to the Faith. The Young Gentleman's laſt Words, *And is by conſequence Infallible in all her Deciſions of Faith*, contain This Propoſition; That Church which cannot fall into Errors deſtructive to the Faith, muſt be *Infallible* in *all* Her Deciſions of Faith. I deny it, not only in the former Senſe of the Words *deſtructive to*, but even in the latter. A Church may be preſerv'd from falling into Errors, which are only *repugnant* to the Faith, without *actually deſtroying* it, or to ſpeak,

as we have all along done, into Errors *damnable* in *one* Senſe; and yet not be *Infallible* in all Her Deciſions of Faith. For there are ſome Points of Faith, (at leaſt as the Church may make them, and as the Church of *Rome* actually does make them) in a Deciſion of which, an Error, tho' of *dangerous Conſequence*, may not be in *its Nature damnable*. For inſtance; We cannot ſay, it would be a *damnable* Sin for the whole Chriſtian World to ſubmit to the Pope, as ſupreme over other Biſhops, at leaſt in a *Patriarchal* Senſe; tho' He has no manner of Right to ſuch a Submiſſion, and ſuch a Submiſſion would be of very *dangerous* Conſequence. Therefore, to *believe* and to *profeſs*, that He is ſo ſupreme, may not be a *damnable Error*. Their Doctrine of the *Seven Sacraments* I take not to be *damnable*, tho' *dangerous*. If then it be admitted, that the Church is ſo directed by the Holy Spirit; nay, is ſo far *Infallible*, if We muſt uſe That Word, that She cannot fall into damnable Errors; yet it does not follow that She is Infallible in *all* Her Deciſions of Faith: Becauſe there may be many Errors in Deciſions of Faith, which may not be damnable, tho' *very dangerous*. I ſay, very dangerous. To which therefore I add, that if I believe Her *Infallible* in *all* Her Deciſions, when She is *not*; ſuch a Belief *may*, and very probably *will*, draw *me* into damnable Errors, tho' *She* Her

Her ſelf falls into none that are ſo. But in This Argument, *The Church cannot fall into damnable Errors, therefore She is Infallible in all her Deciſions*; We need not inſiſt upon the Falſity of the *Conſequence*, tho', as I have ſhewn, it is moſt falſe; ſince, as I have *more fully* ſhewn, and That I *chiefly* inſiſt upon, the *Antecedent* has not been made out. The Church *may* fall into damnable Errors, and yet be *One*, *Holy*, &c. nor has This Writer produc'd the glimmering of an Argument to the contrary. Here likewiſe, as always upon theſe Occaſions, it muſt be remember'd, that, if he had prov'd what he undertook concerning *the Church*, He had done nothing, unleſs He had likewiſe prov'd, that the Church of *Rome* is *the* Church; which, tho' I have here for the greater Strength of the Argument proceeded upon That Suppoſition, He will never be able to do: Nor has He yet attempted it. Hereafter indeed He will attempt it; and then He ſhall be ſure to meet with an Anſwer.

At preſent he quotes 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. where He * ſays, St. *Paul* pronounces *the Church of Chriſt to be the Pillar and Support of the Truth.* And then asks ſeveral Queſtions. *How can this be true; if the Church, eſta-*

* P. 38.

blish'd by Christ, ever proposes false Doctrines for reveal'd Truths? Or requires things inconsistent with Salvation for Conditions of Communion? Can She always be the Pillar and Support of the Truth, unless She be always an unerring Guide in matters of Faith? Answer. 1*st.* It is far from being certain that Those Words, *the Pillar, &c* relate to the Church: They may perhaps relate to *Timothy*; and it is the Opinion of very learned Men, that they do. 2*dly.* If St. *Paul* speaks of the Church; he speaks either of the Church in *general*, or the Church of *Ephesus* in particular, most certainly not of the Church of *Rome.* 3*dly.* By the Church's being the *Pillar and Ground of Truth*, may very well be meant no more, than that according to the *Intent of her Institution*, She always *ought* to be so, not that She always actually *will* be so. Our Lord tells his Disciples, they are the *Salt of the Earth*; and yet supposes that the *Salt may lose its Savour.* Not that there is any such Word as *always* in the Text cited; tho' our Author *twice* mentions it, and lays so much *Stress* upon it. But, 4*thly.* and chiefly. The Church may *maintain* all *necessary Truth*, and yet propose *false Doctrines*, and Terms of Communion *inconsistent with Salvation*; or, in other Words, as we have, in effect, often said already, *hold the Truth*, and *build Falshood upon it*; as the Church

of

of *Rome actually does*. She may therefore be the *Pillar and Support of the Truth*, without being an *unerring Guide*, or ſo much as *free* from *great* and *grievous Errors*. * *And if*, concludes He, *She be ſuch a Guide; I ask one Queſtion more, how can her Faith be reform'd?* How indeed? But if She, the Church of *Rome*, be *not* an unerring Guide; but, on the contrary, overrun with groſs and damnable Errors, as well as with all manner of Wickedneſs and Vice, proceeding from Thoſe Errors; which is the real Truth of the Caſe: then her Faith, and Practice too, may, and ought to be reformed.

† G. *I ſee no other Anſwer to be made to This Queſtion, but boldly aſſerting, that St.* Paul's *Epiſtles, nay, and the Goſpels, as well as the Creed, all which give Evidence to the Doctrine of Infallibility, ſtand full as much in need of a thorough godly Reformation, as the Church of* Rome it ſelf. This is a continuation of the aforeſaid ‖ *Modeſty*; and That is Anſwer ſufficient. What he ſays to the Queſtion, *how a Society of Men* can be *Infallible*, when all *its particular Members are fallible*, is nothing to the Purpoſe; becauſe We utterly deny, and They can never prove,

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‖ See *P.* 85, 86.

that any *Society* of Men is *Infallible. The Church's Infallibility*, says He, *depends not upon any extraordinary inward Lights*, &c. *but upon the gratuitous Promises of God: And cannot He bestow This Privilege, &c.* Ay; But I have prov'd that there are *no* such *gratuitous Promises of God* to the *Church*, any more than to private Persons; and that the Arguments to prove the Contrary, are beyond measure trifling and ridiculous. So all that follows upon a Supposition of such Promises is struck off; and I need say no more of it. Yet I cannot forbear taking notice of one Passage in it. * *For, as Bishop* Pearson *has very judiciously observ'd, tho' the Providence of God has suffer'd even whole particular Churches to perish; yet the Promises of the same God will never permit that they all perish at once.* I ask This Writer, whether He does not believe in his Conscience, that when Bishop *Pearson* wrote This, He thought the Church of *Rome* to be as much a *particular* Church as the Church of *England*? And as likely to *perish*, as any *other* particular Church? If so; I ask again, with what Conscience he could quote That excellent Prelate's Words, spoken of the Church in *general*, as

* P. 39.

serving

ſerving the Cauſe of the Church of *Rome*; and affirm, that He talks *as if He had taken a Fee to plead for her*?

Before I conclude, I cannot but obſerve, that our old Objection ſtands good againſt what This Author diſcourſes about Infallibility, *viz.* that he does not tell us *where it is to be found*. For the *Church* is too *looſe* and *general* a Word. Does He mean *Councils* only? Muſt the *Pope* neceſſarily concur, or no? *&c.* But not to inſiſt upon This, and that we may bring the matter to ſome Iſſue; I ſuppoſe it will be granted on all ſides, that, according to the Romaniſts, the Definitions of the Council of *Trent*, ratify'd by the Pope, are the Definitions of the *Church*. Our Author, as we have ſeen, * inſtances in Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, and Honouring of Reliques, to which He might have added Image-Worſhip, Half-Communion, *&c.* as *Doctrines* of the Church. And We all know the Council of *Trent* makes them *neceſſary to Salvation*. Here then I fix: Every one of Theſe Doctrines is *groſly falſe*; therefore the Church of *Rome actually errs*, and therefore is *not Infallible*. That They are falſe, I have elſewhere prov'd. † *Image-Worſhip* is contrary to the Second Command-

* P. 38. † Popery truly ſtated, &c.

mand

ment. All *Creature-Worship* is contrary to many Texts of Scripture, particularly *Deut.* 6. 13. *Matth.* 4. 10. *Communion in one Kind* is contrary to the expreſs Words of our Saviour's Inſtitution; as They themſelves acknowledge. *Tranſubſtantiation* is contrary, 1*ſt.* To *Scripture*; which aſſures us, that the Bread and Wine *continue* Bread and Wine *after* Conſecration. *Matth.* 26. 29. 1 *Cor.* x. 17. xi. 26, *&c.* 2*dly.* To *Reaſon*; becauſe it implies an hundred Contradictions, * as well as many Blaſphemous Impieties: That the ſame Body, for inſtance, is in Heaven and on Earth at the ſame time; that Man can make God, *&c.* 3dly. To our *Senſes*; becauſe what Papiſts tell us is the Body and Blood of Chriſt, We ſee, feel, ſmell, and taſte, to be Bread and Wine. In vain therefore do they come upon us with their Sophiſtical, perplex'd, puzzling Heap of Stuff; (*puzzling*, to *weak*, *ignorant* People; for, to All who *know* any thing of the matter, nothing, as I have made it appear, can be more *deſpicably fooliſh*) endeavouring to prove, that their Church *cannot* err: When Common Senſe, and our five Senſes tell us She *does* err: Or if She does not *err*,

* Mr. *Chillingworth* reckons up *thirty* in a Breath. *Religion of Proteſtants*, &c. Chap. 4. ‡ 46.

She *lies*, which is worſe: And can *neither* way be an *Infallible Guide*, or *any true* Guide at all. 'Tis much ſurer Reaſoning, as I hinted before, to argue thus *a poſteriori*, The Church of *Rome* actually errs, therefore She is not Infallible; than thus *a priori*, the Church of *Rome* is Infallible, therefore She cannot err. In the Former, the Arguments are *demonſtratively clear*, and the moſt *Illiterate* may underſtand them: In the Latter, They are *difficult* and *obſcure* at beſt; they may poſſibly *puzzle*, but can never *convince*. Had I, which no body ever *will* have, as much Evidence that their *Church's Infallibility is true*, as I have that *Tranſubſtantiation is falſe*; even then I ſhould be but in an *Equilibrium*, and could not aſſent to either. How neceſſarily then muſt my Aſſent be *clearly determined*; when I have *Scripture*, Common *Reaſon*, and my outward *Senſes*, to *convince* me on the one Hand; and nothing but *Duſt* and *Darkneſs* to *blind* and *confound* me, on the other? I ſpeak This Laſt, in the Perſon of one of the *Vulgar*, and *Unlearned*: To Thoſe of a *different* Character the Arguments for Infallibility have, as I ſaid, *no Difficulty* in them; nothing but tranſparent *Sophiſtry*, ſhameful *Inconſequence*, and palpable *Abſurdities*. This I may have Leave to *affirm*; becauſe I have *prov'd* it. Suppoſe then a Perſon perfectly indifferent,

and

and unprejudic'd, and a Stranger in These Parts of the World, to be concern'd in This Enquiry, whether the Church of *Rome* be Infallible, or no? and to be told, that there are the two different Schemes of Arguments above-mentioned: Would it not be *Beginning* at the *wrong End*, and *Misemploying his time*, for Him to pester himself with a *long* Train of *perplex'd*, and at least *seemingly* inconclusive Deductions, pretending to prove that She *cannot* err; when He may in six Minutes, the Arguments at *first Sight* looking *easy* and *natural*, demonstrate beyond all Contradiction, that She *actually does* err? But to conclude, by applying my self to the *meanest* Reader: Suppose You should hear a Man brag, and pretend to prove by unanswerable Arguments, that He is *Invulnerable*, and *Incapable* of any *Sickness* or Disease whatsoever. Perhaps He might amuse you with *Sophistry*, which *You* would not be able to answer; but would you therefore *believe* him? when you should *see* him at *that very time* devoured with *Ulcers*, and *scrofulous Humours*, cover'd Over from Head to Foot with *Wounds*, *and Bruises*, *and putrifying Sores?* He would tell you, it may be, that they are *not* Ulcers, Sores, *&c.* but *Signs of Health*, and in themselves *Beauties.* But I ask again; Would You *believe* Him? If You would; I know not which of the Two would be more extraordinary,

dinary, His *Modeſty*, or Your *Underſtanding*.

To the Sixth SECTION:

The Rule of Faith.

THIS, ſays He, *leads me to the Rule by which the Catholick Church directs it ſelf in all its Deciſions of Faith.* What is it to Us what Rule She directs her ſelf by? She is *Infallible*, it ſeems; and That's enough. If we muſt ſubmit to Her Deciſions, tho' contrary to the Word of God, our Reaſon, and our Senſes; it ſignifies nothing to us, what Rule She goes by, or whether She goes by any Rule, or no. Or, in other Words, there is an End, as to theſe Matters, of all Enquiry, and Argumentation; of the Word of God, unleſs what She, by her own Authority, is pleas'd to call ſo; of common Senſe, and Reaſon; of the Uſe of Seeing, Hearing, Smelling, Taſting, and Handling. According to This, She is, *Her ſelf*, the *Rule* as well as *Judge*;

---

* P. 39.

the

the Standard and Meaſure of Right, and Wrong, of Truth, and Falſehood. In the Controverſy about the *Rule of Faith*, between Papiſts and Proteſtants, the Rule, as I apprehended, was ſuppos'd to be a Rule to all Chriſtians; and the Queſtion was, whether Scripture only, or Scripture and Tradition in Conjunction, were the Rule of Faith to You, and Me, and Every body? But This Author confines it to the Church, (as, in truth, he can hardly prevail with himſelf to talk about any thing elſe) underſtanding by That Word the Teachers and Governours of the Church. Not but that the Queſtion about the Rule of Faith, to whomſoever it relates, as uſually ſtated, and as ſtated by This Author himſelf, if ſome other Doctrines of Popery be true, is ſuperfluous, not to ſay ridiculous. If it be confin'd to the Church; what imports it, whether Scripture only, or Scripture and Tradition together, be the Rule of Faith to Her; ſince nothing, as She ſays, is either Scripture, or Tradition, but what She pleaſes to call ſo? Or to put it more ſtrongly, how can the one, or the other, or both together, be any Rule to her at all? How can She guide her ſelf by the Authority of That, which has no more Authority than She thinks fit to allow it? According to this Suppoſition, therefore, *viz.* her Infallibility, and her Right of declaring what is Scripture, and Tradition, and what not;

not; She is a Rule, and Law, not only to Others, but to her Self likewiſe; and ſo to talk of any other Rule is ſuperfluous, and irrational. If the Enquiry be, what is the Rule of Faith to *all Chriſtians* to You, and Me, and Every body elſe in particular? the Abſurdities are the ſame. What is it to me, whether Scripture only, or That and Tradition together, be my Rule; or rather how can Either be *my Rule* at all; if I am to take Both *abſolutely upon Truſt* from the Infallible Church; and muſt implicitly depend upon Her, not only as to the *Senſe* and *Meaning*, but as to the *Reality*, and *Being* of them? According to This, She alone is my Rule of Faith; and I can have no other.

Nevertheleſs, ſince our Author is pleas'd to give us a Section upon This Queſtion, *What is the Rule of Faith*; and ſince We, who deny, and have ſufficiently diſprov'd the Church's Infallibility, *&c.* may diſcuſs it without Incongruity, tho' He cannot; I ſhall follow him as He leads, maintaining This Theſis, That *Scripture only*, *without Tradition*, is the *Word of God*, and the *Rule of our Faith*.

The Contrary, * he tells us, *has been fully demonſtrated in a Book*, entitled, *The*

* *P.* 40.

Rule

Rule of Faith; printed Anno. 1721. I never ſaw the Book: but am ſo well acquainted with *Popiſh Demonſtrations*, and *Popiſh Modeſty*, and all the Papiſts have to ſay, upon This, or any other Argument; that I almoſt as well know the Subſtance of it, as if I had read it. Beſides; our Author will undoubtedly give us the *Flower* of the *Demonſtration*: And with Him therefore we proceed.

Having ſaid, * *it is plain Fact*, 1ſt. *That Chriſt himſelf laid the Foundation of the Church by preaching only*; 2dly. *That he never laid any Command upon the Apoſtles to write, but only to preach the Goſpel to all Nations*; (He ſeems to be angry with the Apoſtles for their over Officiouſneſs in Writing at all: But how does he prove that our Saviour never laid his Commands upon them to write? Did He ſay nothing to his Apoſtles but what is recorded in Scripture? However, did they write purely of their own Heads? Were they not mov'd to it by the Holy Ghoſt?) *and* 3dly *That in effect they preached for ſeveral Years, before they wrote any of the Canonical Books of Scripture*; He adds, *and tho' they had never written at all*, as the Papiſts, 'tis plain, are heartily vex'd

* P. 41.

they

they ever did, and would aboliſh their Writings from the Face of the Earth, if they were able; *but deliver'd the whole Chriſtian Doctrine by Word of Mouth to Thoſe who ſucceeded them in their Apoſtolical Charge; we ſhould have been oblig'd to receive it as the Word of God, and therefore with the ſame Reſpect as we now do the holy Scripture.*

Tho' they had never written at all, &c! But They *have* written; and ſo the Caſe is alter'd. *To Thoſe who ſucceeded them in their Apoſtolical Charge!* Strictly ſpeaking, there were *None* who ſucceeded them in their Apoſtolical Charge; but let That paſs. This is harping upon the old String; * as if the Apoſtles deliver'd the Goſpel, both by Speaking and Writing, not to the *whole World*, but to *Biſhops* and *Paſtors* only. But not to inſiſt upon That neither: *Tho' They had deliver'd the Chriſtian Doctrine only by Word of Mouth; We ſhould have been oblig'd*, He ſays, *to receive it as the Word of God.* True; if we could *prove* This or That Doctrine to have been *delivered* by *Them*, tho' *by Word of Mouth* only. But *That* is the grand Point of all: Tho' according to This Gentleman, 'tis a Circum-

* See P. 31, 32, 33.

ſtance not worth taking notice of; for he ſays nothing at all about it. His next Words are theſe. * *Whence it follows,* 1ſt. *That the unwritten Word of God was the whole Rule of Faith to the primitive Chriſtians, before the Scriptures could poſſibly be a Part of it.* Without doubt, the Written Word was the whole Rule, before the Scriptures were Part of it; as ſurely as one Unit is the Whole, before another is added to it. † *And it might have continued ſo for ever, if Providence had pleaſed to order it ſo.* It might *ſo*; Nay, (which is more) it certainly *would*, if Providence had *ſo* ordered it. But it has pleaſed Providence to order it otherwiſe, by giving the World a Written Goſpel; which, no doubt, was for this plain Reaſon, becauſe it was *morally impoſſible* that the Chriſtian Doctrine ſhould be deliver'd down thro' all Ages by *Word of Mouth* only.

‖ *It follows,* 2dly. continues He, *that Scriptures are ſo far from being the whole neceſſary Rule of the Chriſtian Faith; that they are not (abſolutely ſpeaking) even a neceſſary Part of that Rule: as the above-ſaid Author has fully prov'd.* That is, becauſe Chriſt laid the Foundation of the Church by Preaching only; and did not command

---

* *P.* 41. † *Ibid.* ‖ *Ibid.*

his

his Apoſtles to write; and becauſe They preach'd before they wrote; and if they had never written at all, but deliver'd their Doctrine only by Word of Mouth, we had been bound to receive it: THEREFORE *the Scriptures are ſo far*, &c. This *Conſequence* conſiſts of two Branches. 1ſt. That the Scriptures are not the *whole neceſſary* Rule of Faith. 2dly. That they are not (abſolutely ſpeaking) ſo much as a neceſſary *Part* of it. As to the Firſt; Does it *follow*, that becauſe our Saviour and his Apoſtles *did* Thus or Thus, and *might have done* Thus or Thus, and *if they had*, we had been oblig'd to do Thus or Thus, as above recited; Therefore *They have* ſo proceeded, as that in *Fact*, the Scriptures *are not* the whole neceſſary Rule of Faith? *We* ſay, that tho' Chriſt founded the Goſpel by preaching only; tho' we ſhould grant, as we do not, that he never commanded his Apoſtles to write; tho' They preach'd before they wrote; and if they had deliver'd their Doctrine by Word of Mouth only, we ſhould have been obliged to receive it as God's Word; provided we could prove This or That Doctrine to have been deliver'd by them: Yet *Now*, as Things ſtand, there is *actually* no Part of the Rule of Faith, but in the Scripture. Let our Adverſaries prove there *is* any *other*; and ſhew us *what* it is, and *where* it is: And they will do their Buſineſs effectually.

But it can never be made out by ſo inconſequent a Conſequence as This is. The Second Branch of the Conſequence is, *That the Scriptures are not* (*abſolutely ſpeaking*) *even a neceſſary Part of the Rule of Faith.* What means he by *abſolutely ſpeaking?* Are they ſo *in fact*, and as *Things now ſtand*; or are they not? He afterwards grants they *are*; and I will not cavil. The Meaning therefore ſeems to be, tho' 'tis ſtrangely expreſs'd, that it is not in the *Reaſon*, and *Nature of Things*, eſſentially, and *abſolutely* neceſſary, that even a *Part* of the *Rule of Faith* ſhould be committed to Writing; becauſe it *might* have been, (tho' in fact he grants it is not) *all* deliver'd by *Word of Mouth.* It *might* indeed: But it would have been *uſeleſs*, if it *had*; for any conſiderable *Time*, I mean; or at any conſiderable diſtance of *Place* from the Speakers. It might be truly deliver'd to a few Perſons by Word of Mouth only; but not to Millions of Millions; not for 1700 Years; not all the World over. Yet our Author inſiſts, that * *all neceſſary Points of reveal'd Faith could have been ſafely convey'd to* Us, *tho' the New Teſtament had never been writ.* For This Aſſertion he gives no Reaſon; unleſs his own further Aſſertions of the ſame Thing

* *P.* 42.

may

may paſs for Reaſons. † *The Creed could have been remember'd in all Ages*, &c. *All neceſſary Points might have been reduced to ſo ſmall a Compaſs, that they might have been tranſmitted to the moſt diſtant Ages, with the ſame Safety as the Creed it ſelf, by Tradition only. And the faithful might have preſerv'd them in their Hearts and Minds, tho' they had never had thoſe farther Lights which the New Teſtament now furniſhes them with.* All this is fairly *ſaid*; but how is it *prov'd*? On the contrary, I appeal to the common Senſe and Experience of Mankind, whether the Thing be not *morally impoſſible*. I have juſt now given my Reaſons; and ſhall not repeat them. But I have ſomething to add here; which is, That I doubt our Author's Doctrine borders upon Blaſphemy; or rather *is ſo*. The Scriptures are dictated by God; and, according to his Account, are, as to all neceſſary Points, ſuperfluous. Does not doing Things ſuperfluous argue Weakneſs, and Want of Wiſdom? Whatever therefore our Author's *above-ſaid Author* is pretended to have fully *prov'd*; it appears from what I have Here, tho' very Briefly, alledg'd, that he neither has prov'd, nor can prove, the Point propos'd; unleſs he can ſhew that *Nonſenſe* is agreeable to *hu-*

† *Ibid*

man Reason, and *Blasphemy* to the *Christian Religion*.

* *However, as Providence has order'd Things, the Holy Scriptures*, he is pleas'd to grant, *are without all Dispute a most inestimable Treasure, and an Infallible Rule of Faith*; WHEN RIGHTLY UNDERSTOOD. That Last was well put in: To insinuate that they are so obscure as not to be intelligible to private Persons; that for the right Understanding of them, we are wholly obliged to the *Church*; and are to acquiesce in her *Interpretations of* them, tho' never so *contrary* to their *plain* Meaning. This is the known Doctrine of the Romanists; and, notwithstanding This forc'd Compliment upon the Scriptures, it quite evacuates Those sacred Writings, and makes them no Rule at all. † *But that they are not the whole Rule of Faith, and that unwritten Apostolical Traditions have* ALWAYS *been at least a necessary Part of this Rule, may*, He affirms, *be clearly made out*. And he accordingly sets himself to make it out, both from *Scripture*, and the Writings of the *Fathers*.

His Proofs from *Scripture* are, according to Custom, *quite beside the Question*; prove nothing but what *Nobody denies*; and are *nothing* at all to the *Purpose*. He observes a

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

First,

Firſt, that * *It* (the Scripture) *no where declares that all the particular Points of the Chriſtian Doctrine, which the Apoſtles taught by Word of Mouth, are expreſs'd in their Canonical Writings.* What if it does not declare ſo? Our own *Reaſon* tells us that nothing is to be receiv'd by us, as the Word of God, but what we can *prove* to be ſuch: And That is ſufficient. Does it any where declare that *Itſelf* is *inſufficient*? Or that any thing *unwritten* is to be *receiv'd* as *God's* Word throughout *all Ages*? Yes; if we will take things as our Author repreſents them, without any Examination. For he proceeds Thus. ‖ *It over and above recommends Apoſtolical Traditions, in the moſt expreſs and poſitive Terms.* Who denies *Apoſtolical Traditions?* He ſets out with his uſual ſtumbling, and miſtakes the Queſtion in the Firſt Words. He himſelf, but five Lines before, propos'd to prove *that Scripture is not the whole Rule, and that unwritten Apoſtolical Traditions have* ALWAYS *been a neceſſary Part of it.* Now he is proving that the Scripture recommends *Apoſtolical Traditions*; and in truth, his alledg'd Texts will prove no more. But what is This to the Point? Who doubts but that there were Apoſtolical Traditions, even by Word

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‖ *Ibid.*

of Mouth, in the Times of the Apoſtles? There are ſome Apoſtolical Traditions Now; The Scriptures are ſuch. There may now be ſome which are not in the Scriptures, relating to Diſcipline, and Order, tho' not to Points of Faith: And could it be *prov'd* to us, that there are any relating even to Points of Faith; we would certainly receive them. But is This the ſame Thing as to ſay, that *the Scriptures are not* NOW *the whole Rule of Faith; but that unwritten Apoſtolical Traditions have been* ALWAYS *a neceſſary Part of it?* Or does the one *follow* from the other by any thing like a *Conſequence?* To ſhew I do not wrong our Author, I will produce his Proofs at large; diſtinguiſhing the *Emphatical* Words, as He does. * *Now I praiſe you Brethren,* (ſays St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 2.) *becauſe you remember me in all things, and keep the Traditions as I have deliver'd them to you. And again,* 2 Theſ. ii. 15. *Therefore, Brethren, ſtand faſt, and hold the Traditions, which you have been taught, whether by* WORD, *or by our Epiſtle. And ſoon after,* 2 Theſ. iii. 6. *Now we command you, Brethren, in the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to withdraw yourſelves from every Brother that walks diſorderly, and not after the Tradition which ye receiv'd of*

* *Ibid.* and P.

Us.

Us. To Theſe three Texts, the Anſwer is the ſame; and has been given already. It does not follow, that becauſe the Apoſtles deliver'd their Doctrines by *Speaking*, as well as *Writing*, and it ought to be receiv'd either way, when known to be their Doctrine, which is all Theſe Texts prove, and which Nobody denies; therefore the Scriptures are not *Now* ſufficient, but Traditions are neceſſary. Our Author ſays nothing of his own, to reinforce his Argument; but quotes * a *Proteſtant Author* of a Book entitled *Tradition neceſſary*: Who ſays, *Here we ſee plain Mention of St.* Paul's *Traditions, conſequently of Apoſtolical Traditions deliver'd by Word of Mouth, as well as by Epiſtles, or in Writing; and a Condemnation of thoſe who do not equally obſerve both.* This *Proteſtant* Author, whoever he be, for I know him not, ſpeaks a little inaccurately: But I ſee no Reaſon, why our *Popiſh* Author ſhould cite Theſe Words as favouring *his* Cauſe; or ſuppoſe the Writer of them to be, upon This Conceſſion, in danger † *of falling under that Condemnation* for continuing a Proteſtant in This, or any other Article. Becauſe we do not reject any *Apoſtolical Tradition*: Had we liv'd in the Apoſtles' Times, we would have receiv'd the

* *P.* 43. † *Ibid.*

oral

oral ones as of equal Authority with the *written* ones; and are now as ready to receive any of the former Kind as of the latter, if They are *prov'd* to be *really Apostolical.* But He has more Proofs behind. * *This however is certain that the Apostles were extremely vigilant in giving full Instructions to Those they ordain'd; that they might also be able to instruct others.* Doubtless. But what solemn Trifling is This? And whither tends it? Why, † *These Instructions are the* sacred depositum, *of which St.* Paul *says to* Timothy, *keep That which is committed to thy Trust.* 1 Tim. vi. 20. *Timothy* was to *keep That which was committed to his Trust*; Therefore OUR *Rule of Faith* is both *Scripture*, and *oral Tradition.* Had there been any Mention of Tradition; even Then it had been nothing to the Purpose, for the Reasons aforesaid: But here is really *no* Mention of it. *And again; hold fast the Form of sound Words, which thou hast* HEARD *of me; That good Trust which was committed to thee, keep by the holy Ghost, which dwelleth in us.* 2 Tim. xiii. 14. *And more fully,* (how much *more fully*, I desire the Reader to observe) *the Things which thou hast* HEARD *from me, before many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful Men; who may*

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

be

be able to teach others alſo. 2 Tim. ii. 2. In ſhort, *Timothy* had HEARD Things from St. *Paul*; and was to preſerve inviolate, and faithfully to deliver to other Teachers, what he had HEARD, that they might be able to teach others; *Ergo*, OUR Rule of Faith is both Scripture, and oral Tradition. And is not This an Admirable Conſequence? *The form of ſound Words*, what *Timothy* had heard, and all Points of Faith, which *at firſt* were only ſpoken, were *afterwards* written, and are now contain'd in Scripture. Or, in another and perhaps plainer Way of ſpeaking, there is now no Word of God, but what is in Scripture. If I am ask'd, how We prove That: I anſwer, *1ſt.* We are not bound to prove it; but our Adverſaries are bound to prove the Contrary. We and They agree in receiving the Scriptures as the Word of God: But then They ſay, ſomething elſe is the Word of God, beſide Scripture. We reply, *non conſtat*: Let them *prove* any Doctrine, or Tradition, not contain'd in Scripture, to be the Word of God; and We will embrace it as ſuch. Not but that, *2dly.* We can prove our Aſſertion from Scripture itſelf, which They acknowledge to be the Word of God. I mean from Thoſe Texts which declare the *Sufficiency* of *Scripture*: Particularly, 2 *Tim.* iii. 15, 16, 17. For if the Scripture be ſufficient, it muſt contain the whole Word of God; and if ſo, our Adverſaries

ſaries themſelves will acknowledge there is no Word of God any where elſe.

What our Author adds as from his *abovemention'd Proteſtant Writer*, (how truly he has quoted, *He* beſt knows) does indeed favour the Cauſe he is defending; and ſo I ſhall conſider it, as if it were his own. * *Thus it is evident from Scriptures themſelves, that the* WHOLE *of Chriſtianity was at firſt deliver'd to the Biſhops ſucceeding the Apoſtles by oral Tradition; and they were alſo commanded to keep it, and deliver it to their Succeſſors in the ſame manner.* Is there one Word about the WHOLE *of Chriſtianity* in the Texts alledg'd? Let the Reader look upon them again. Does oral Tradition *exclude* Writing? And becauſe *ſome* things were deliver'd by Word of Mouth to the Biſhops ſucceeding the Apoſtles, does it follow that *all* were ſo? Did not the Apoſtles *write* the Goſpel, as well as *preach* it? And were not their *Writings* of at leaſt *as much* Uſe, as their verbal Inſtructions? According to This Man's Account, one would think the Apoſtles had told their Succeſſors, that though 'tis true They had written the Goſpel; yet it was no Matter whether They took any Notice of it, or not. That Theſe Succeſſors were

* *Ibid.*

to

to deliver the *whole of Chriſtianity*, or indeed any Part of it, to *their* Succeſſors *in the ſame manner*, that is, by Word of Mouth, there is not the leaſt Hint of Evidence: For does it follow, that becauſe *Timothy* was to commit to others what he had *heard*, therefore he muſt needs do it by *ſpeaking*? Could he not deliver down the Writings of the Apoſtles, in which were contain'd all Points of Faith, which he had *heard*; tho' they were not all written, *when* he heard them? But the *Proteſtant*, or *Popiſh*, Writer proceeds. * *Nor is it any where found in Scripture by St.* Paul, *or any other of the Apoſtles, that they would either jointly, or ſeparately, write down all that they had taught as neceſſary to Salvation; or that they would make ſuch a compleat Canon of them, that nothing ſhould be neceſſary to Salvation, but what ſhould be found in thoſe Writings.* FOUND *in Scripture by St.* Paul, *&c?* I ſuppoſe he would ſay, *aſſerted*; or ſome ſuch Word. But what if it be not *found in Scripture*? 'Tis found in Common Senſe, (which is the Gift of God as well as Scripture,) that nothing is *neceſſary to Salvation* but what *God makes ſo*; and that we ought to receive nothing as the Word of God, but what is *prov'd* to be ſuch.

Our Author's Proofs from the † *Fathers*

* *P. Ibid.* † *P.* 44, 45.

were

were collected to his hand in their renowned *Nubes Testium*: And the Confutation of them is as ready made to Mine, in an Answer to That infamous Heap of false and impertinent Quotations, printed at *London* for *Henry Mortlock* in 1688. *P.* 36. Chap. iii. *Concerning Tradition*: To which I refer the Reader. * The pretended Proof from St. *Chrysostom* is answer'd, *P.* 41. That from St. *Basil*, *P.* 40. Those from *Epiphanius*, *P.* 41. That from *Tertullian*, *P.* 40. That from *Irenæus*, *P.* 36, 38, 39, 40. As to the four First, the Sum is This: The *Traditions* They speak of, relate either to the *Times* of the *Apostles*, or to Matters of *Practice*, *Rites*, and *Discipline* in the Church, nor to Points of *Faith*; and therefore are nothing to our Purpose: Those very Fathers, in other Places, asserting the *Sufficiency* and *Fullness* of the *Scriptures* for all things necessary to Salvation. Upon *Irenæus* I shall be more particular; because what is said of the Quotation from Him by the Writer to whom I refer, may very well admit of a Supplement. † *You may have Truth*, says That Father, as he is quoted, and translated by our Author, *from the*

---

* See also a Book entitled *The Primitive Fathers no Papists*; in Answer to the Vindication of *Nubes Testium*. *P.* 31, &c.

† *Ibid.*

Church;

Church; *with which the Apoſtles have depoſited all Truth.* But what has This to do with *unwritten Tradition*? The Apoſtles depoſited the *Scriptures* with the Church; and the *Creed*, ſo far as it went: And in *them* are contained all Truth. * *We muſt learn from Her the Tradition of Faith.* I anſwer, 1*ſt*. This is wrong tranſlated: In *Irenæus* 'tis † *the Tradition of Truth.* 2dly Suppoſing the Word *Faith* had been here us'd; We have it from the Church, by having it from the Scriptures, which are depoſited with her: Thoſe Scriptures being, moreover, interpreted, in doubtful and difficult Points, by *truly Catholick* Tradition; that is, by the *Conſent* of the *Univerſal Church* in *all* Ages; or, by the Confeſſion of all Parties, the *pureſt* Ages. And This We Proteſtants heartily Embrace. Beſides; many things might be ſaid of the *Church*, and *Tradition*, in *Irenæus*'s Time, who liv'd in the next Age to That of the Apoſtles; which will by no means quadrate with our preſent Circumſtances. ‖ *For if the Diſpute were of any little Matter; ſhould we not conſult the moſt antient Churches, and derive our Evidence from Thence?* Yes; But what is This to *Points of Faith* deli-

---

* *Ibid.* † *Traditionem Veritatis.* Lib. iii. *Chap.* 4. *P.* 205. Edit. Grabian. ‖ *Ibid.*

ver'd

ver'd by *oral Tradition* only? when here is no Mention of *Points of Faith* (for sure they are not *little Matters*) or of *oral Tradition.* I observe too, that our Author leaves out a Material Clause: *Irenæus* says *in antiquissimas recurrere Ecclesias,* IN QUIBUS APOSTOLI CONVERSATI SUNT. By which last Words, which are here omitted, He lays the Stress of his Argument upon the *Authority* of the *Apostles,* not of the *Church,* or of her *Traditions.* * *And what if the Apostles had left us no Scriptures; must we not follow the Rule of Tradition entrusted with them, to whom they left their Sees?* Tho' several Words are here again wrong translated; yet to let That pass, and take the Whole as our Author gives it us: I answer 1*st.* It makes against him: For it implies that since the Apostles *have* left us Scriptures, we ought to be guided by *Them.* And if he reply They have left us *oral Traditions* likewise; I answer, 2*dly.* Let him prove *That* NOW, as *Irenæus* supposes the Tradition He speaks of, could have been *prov'd* to be Theirs THEN; and he will say something to the Purpose, otherwise Not. † *As many barbarous Nations, without any Books of Scripture, yet believing in Christ have Salvation written in their Hearts by the*

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

Holy

Holy Ghoſt, and carefully preſerve the old Traditions. I anſwer, *1ſt.* We have over and over granted, that a People may be converted by Word of Mouth only; and preſerve the Chriſtian Doctrine, without Books, for a little time, but not for many Ages. *2dly.* Here again, We anſwer as often Before: Thoſe of whom This Father ſpeaks, had ſufficient Evidence that the Traditions were genuine: Let the Papiſts give us ſufficient Evidence that Theirs are ſo, and we will receive them.

Upon the Whole, *Irenæus* (as the above-named Writer ſhews in the Places referr'd to) condemns Thoſe *Hereticks*, who *calumniated* the *Scriptures*, and defended their *Errors* by *oral Tradition.* The Tradition he Himſelf ſpeaks of, is what the *Apoſtles* had *preach'd*; and what they *preach'd*, he ſays they afterwards committed to *writing.* In the firſt Chapter of this very Book, from which our Author makes his Quotation, He has Theſe Words. * *We have the Knowledge of the Oeconomy of our Salvation by no Others than Thoſe, by whom the Goſpel came to us. Which Goſpel* THEN *indeed they*

* Non enim per alios Diſpoſitionem Salutis noſtræ cognovimus, quam per eos per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos; Quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt; poſtea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam Fidei noſtræ futurum. *Lib.* 3. *Chap.* i. *P.* 198. Edit. Grab.

preached; but AFTERWARDS *by the Will* OF GOD, *they deliver'd it to us in the* SCRIPTURES, *that* IT *might be the* FOUNDATION, *and* PILLAR *of our* FAITH. *Irenæus* therefore is ſo far from favouring the Popiſh Cauſe in this Point; that he is expreſſly, and directly againſt it.

* G. *Sir, You have here produced the clear Teſtimonies both of Scriptures, and the ancient Fathers for Apoſtolical Traditions.* How clear his Teſtimonies are both from *Scripture*, and *Fathers*, to prove the *only Thing* which he *ought* to prove, we have throughly conſider'd: As for *Apoſtolical Traditions*, I know Nobody among Us that denies the Authority of them. † *But can you give me any particular Inſtances of neceſſary Duties, or Articles of Chriſtian Faith, allow'd for ſuch by Proteſtants themſelves, which cannot be prov'd from Scriptures, and are grounded wholly upon Apoſtolical Traditions?* We tell them again, and again, We are ready to acknowledge any *Duty* as *neceſſary*, any *Doctrine* as an *Article of Faith*; if it be *prov'd* to be ſo by *Apoſtolical* Tradition *truly* ſuch. And therefore the Argument contain'd in the Anſwer to This Queſtion, tending to prove us *incoherent with ourſelves*, for receiving *ſome* Apoſtolical Tra-

* *Ibid.* † P. 46.

ditions,

ditions, and rejecting *others*, is impertinent, and goes upon a falſe Suppoſition. However, tho' 'tis more than I am oblig'd to, I will examine it particularly.

* P. *I could produce a conſiderable Number; but to avoid being tedious, I ſhall make choice only of three; allow'd of, as you deſire, by Proteſtants themſelves.* 1ſt. *The Obſervance of the Chriſtian Sabbath againſt Jews, and Sabbatarians.* 2dly. *The Validity of Infant-Baptiſm againſt Anabaptiſts.* 3dly. *The Validity of Baptiſm adminiſter'd by Hereticks againſt the Donatiſts*, &c. I anſwer, 1*ſt*. 'Tis falſe, to ſay that Proteſtants acknowledge any one of Theſe to be an *Article of Faith.* He is Here in the ſame Miſtake, or Miſrepreſentation, before taken notice of P. 29. The laſt of Them is ſo far from being an *Article of Faith*; that 'tis not *a certain Truth.* This Author himſelf owns *it was a Subject of Diſpute* between St. *Cyprian*, and Pope *Stephen*; And we all know St. *Cyprian* liv'd and dy'd in the Opinion that *ſuch Baptiſm was invalid.* And did That eminent Saint, and Martyr, a Saint in the Church of *Rome's* Account, as well as Ours, live and dye in the Denial of an *Article of Faith*? If he did; he was the Strangeſt *Saint*, and *Martyr* I e-

---

* *Ibid.* † P. 47.

ver heard of. But of This more in its place. 2*dly*. The Observance of the *Christian Sabbath*, as a *necessary Duty*, is founded partly upon the *Equity* of the fourth Commandment, obliging us to keep holy *one day* out of *seven*; partly upon the *Example of the Apostles* recorded in Scripture, (and therefore upon Scripture itself) changing the *seventh* Day of the Week to the *First*. This therefore is a *necessary Duty*; but it is *founded upon Scripture*. And so, in the next place, is the *Validity* of *Infant-Baptism*; tho' there be not any *plain Text* for it, if by a *plain* one he means a Text directly, and expresly asserting it. But is nothing to be *prov'd from* Scripture, but what is *expresly asserted* in it? What will become of the Church of *Rome*'s Infallibility? Our Saviour instituted *Baptism* in the Room of *Circumcision*; and *Infants* were *circumcised*. He commanded his Apostles to *baptize all Nations*; and in Them *Children* are included. The Apostles baptized whole Families; and of Families Children are a necessary Part. If it be said They could not be included, because they are not *capable* of Baptism; I answer, they are as capable of Baptism as of Circumcision. Our Saviour commanded Children to be *brought to him, laid his hands upon them, blessed them*, and declared that the *Kingdom of Heaven* belongs to them. And St. *Paul* pronounces them *holy*.

* It

* It is evident from Scripture therefore that they are *capable* of Baptiſm; and conſequently that if other Circumſtances be right, which is here ſuppos'd on all Sides, their Baptiſm is *valid*. But 3*dly*. Suppoſe we had nothing but extra-ſcriptural *Apoſtolical Tradition* for Theſe two Points; ſtill it is *true* Apoſtolical Tradition: Let the Papiſts *prove theirs* to be *ſo*; as I have often ſaid.

And the ſame I *thus far* ſay of the *Validity of the Baptiſm adminiſter'd by Hereticks*. IF it be prov'd by *true* Apoſtolical Tradition; Well, and Good; We receive it: Nay, we will embrace it as an Article of Faith; *if* it be ſhewn, that the Apoſtles made it ſo. The Scripture indeed ſays nothing about it; nor Apoſtolical Tradition neither, as I know of. And yet it may be *true*, for all that. † *It was*, ſays our Author, *the Subject of the Diſpute between St.* Cyprian, *and Pope* Stephen; *and afterwards between the* Donatiſts, *and the Catholick Church. But St.* Auſtin *who drew his learned Pen in defence of the Catholick Cauſe againſt Thoſe Hereticks*, &c. The *Donatiſts* were not *Hereticks*, nor ſo accounted by the Catholick Church, for denying the *Validity* of thoſe *Baptiſms*; for St. *Cyprian*

* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. † *P.* 47.

was of the ſame Opinion; and I hope He was no Heretick. But as the *Novatians*, with whom St. *Cyprian* himſelf had ſuch a ſtruggle, were not deem'd Hereticks and Schiſmaticks for their Opinion againſt reſtoring the *Laps'd* to the Communion of the Church; ſo neither were the *Donatiſts* afterwards for their Opinion above-mention'd: But *Both* were eſteem'd Hereticks and Schiſmaticks by the Church, partly for being like the *Papiſts*; that is, for calling their own Faction the *only Church*, and making *all the World* Hereticks, and Schiſmaticks, except *themſelves*. For my part, I wonder at the Confidence of a Papiſt in talking of the Hereſy and Schiſm of the *Donatiſts*, or *Novatians*; Thoſe Ancient Peſts of the Church ſo exactly reſembling Theſe modern ones in This particular. St. *Auſtin*, however, * *frankly own'd*, it ſeems, *that It* [the Validity of Heretical Baptiſm] *could not be decided by Scripture. But that after the Death of St.* Cyprian, *the Church had interpos'd her Authority in the Council of* Arles, *and determined the matter by the Infallible Rule of Apoſtolical Tradition. St.* Auſtin's *Words are remarkable. Of this*, ſays he, *the Apoſtles have left us no Direction in Writing. But the Cuſtom which was objected againſt* St. CYPRIAN MUST BE BELIEVED TO HAVE BEGUN BY TRADITION FROM THEM. *As there are many Things*

* *Ibid.*

which

which are held by the Whole Church, and are therefore rightly believ'd to have been order'd by the Apoſtles, ALTHO' THEY BE NOT FOUND IN SCRIPTURE. *l.* 5. de bapt. contra Don. c. 23. I have tranſcrib'd all our Author's *Capital Letters*; that I might give every thing the full Streſs he lays upon it. Tho' I cannot find in This Paſſage, or any Place near it, or any other part of St. *Auguſtin*'s Works, the Council of *Arles* mentioned by Name, or Thoſe Words *the Infallible Rule of Apoſtolical Tradition*; tho' St. *Cyprian*'s Judgment, for ought I know, may be as conſiderable as St. *Auguſtin*'s, and the Authority of the Council of *Arles* not ſuperior to That of two more ancient ones at *Carthage*, which determin'd the Contrary; and laſtly, tho' 'tis a mere *gratis dictum* of St. *Auguſtin*'s, that *the Cuſtom* he ſpeaks of MUST BE BELIEVED, *&c.* yet waving all This; St. *Auguſtin* here aſſerts nothing, to our preſent Purpoſe, but that Apoſtolical Traditions are to be received, undoubtedly meaning *true*, not *falſe* ones; and that we ought to acknowledge ſome things not only as true, but as deriv'd from the Apoſtles, tho' they be not found in Scripture. And who among *Us* denies either of Theſe Propoſitions? Do *We* reject either the Traditions of the Apoſtles, or the Cuſtoms and Practices of the Primitive, and Univerſal Church? Do we not prove *Epiſco-*

pacy, for inſtance, to be of *Apoſtolical* Inſtitution, by the Teſtimony and conſtant Practice of the Church, from the Days of the Apoſtles, down to our own? Sure This Author forgets he is writing againſt the *Church* of *England*; and thinks he has to do with *Enthuſiaſts*, and *Fanaticks*.

* He will needs have it, that our Doctrine is different from This of St. *Auguſtin*, becauſe we declare in our 6th *Article* that *Scripture contains all things neceſſary to Salvation*, and that nothing is an *Article of Faith*, but what may be prov'd from thence. But St. *Auguſtin*, as we have ſeen, ſays nothing Here about *Articles of Faith*; nor any thing elſe but what we acknowledge. Does it follow, that becauſe innumerable things are *true*, and ſome *Apoſtolical*, which are not in Scripture; therefore there are *Articles of Faith*, which are not in Scripture?

The Young Gentleman goes farther; and is *ſure* that *the Church of* England, by That *Doctrine of the 6th Article is incoherent with herſelf.* ‖ *For does She not*, ſays he, *require of any man* (I ſuppoſe it ſhould be, *every man*) *to believe the indiſpenſible Obligation of the Chriſtian Sabbath? And where is that read in Scripture, or how can it be prov'd thereby?* I have ſhewn how it can be *prov'd thereby*. P. 132. ‡ *Again, does*

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‖ *P.* 48. ‡ *Ibid.*

ſhe

She not require of all true Proteſtants to believe the Validity of Infant-Baptiſm? Not as I know of: She *ſuppoſes* it to be *true*, if he pleaſes; She *aſſerts*, that Infants *may* be, and *ought to be* baptiz'd; and *requires* that her *Miniſters* (not *all true Proteſtants*) *ſubſcribe* to this Aſſertion, among many others; not one in ten of which is, or is pretended to be, *an Article of Faith.* Not but that the *Validity of Infant-Baptiſm* is *clearly*, and *plainly* to be *proved from Scripture*; as I have ſhewn P. 132. &c. * *And* [*does She not require all true Proteſtants to believe*] *that This Sacrament is validly adminiſter'd by Hereticks?* No, She does not; Nor did any Church upon Earth (unleſs the Church of *Rome* does) ever dream that it was an *Article of Faith*, or the Belief of it *neceſſary to Salvation.* † *Or does She require of them to believe both the one, and the other, without judging the Belief of them neceſſary to Salvation? That would be ſtrange indeed.* She *requires* nothing, as to this Matter, but that (all her *Members* being *ſuppoſ'd* to believe all the *Articles* of the Chriſtian *Faith*) her *Miniſters*, for the Preſervation of Unity, ſhould *ſubſcribe* not only to *Them*, but to many *other* Articles, which *She* believes to be *true*, tho' the Belief of them is not *neceſ-*

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

ſary

sary to Salvation, (for every thing that is *true*, is not an *Article of Faith*) and charitably hopes, that None admitted to her Ministry will profess them, unless *They* likewise *believe* them. And where is the mighty *Strangeness* of This? She does not, by her own Authority, *require* any body to *believe any* thing; tho' She requires certain particular Persons to *profess* their *Belief* of some Things, *if* they *do believe* them: Or, in plainer Words, She does not *require* any body to believe any thing, because *She says it*. That belongs to the Church of *Rome*, not to *Her*.

* The Preceptor charges us with *another remarkable Incoherency*, (They are Both very liberal of their *Incoherencies*) *in the same 6th Article. For*, says he, *it goes on thus.* "*By holy Scriptures we understand those* "*Canonical Books of the old and new Tes-*"*tament, of whose Authority was never any* "*Doubt in the* CHURCH." *Now I presume the Belief of the Canonical Books, both of the Old and New Testament, is required by the Church of* England, *as an Article of Faith necessary to Salvation.* Enough having been said of the Word *require* in the foregoing Paragraph; I answer, 1*st*. That the Scriptures are of divine Inspiration, is

* *Ibid.*

not

not an *Article of Faith* as I have ſhewn above; nor does the Church of *England* ſay it is: Tho', 2*dly*. To believe that the *Old and New Teſtament* are, *in general*, or *in the main*, the Word of God, is *ordinarily*, and *ſtatedly*, *neceſſary to Salvation*, in a Chriſtian Country; and the Church of *England* ſuppoſes ſo. Becauſe, ordinarily ſpeaking, it is previous and preparatory to all Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, and all Duties of the Chriſtian Religion: And the Fact itſelf, that they are the Word of God, is eaſy to be proved. Nor does This imply any thing incoherent with the *ſixth Article* of our Church; Becauſe That Article by its very Title [*of the ſufficiency of Holy Scriptures for Salvation*] manifeſtly *preſuppoſes* the Belief of their being the *Word of God*; and therefore when She ſays they *contain all things neceſſary to Salvation*, This Point is manifeſtly *excepted*: Eſpecially conſidering that She joins thoſe Words *neceſſary to Salvation* with *Articles of Faith*, which is remarkable: And *This* Point is *not* an Article of Faith; as Before obſerv'd. 3*dly*. Tho' the Church of *England* upon good Evidence receives all thoſe Books, *&c.* as *Canonical*; yet She no where ſays, that it is *neceſſary to Salvation*, to receive every one of them as ſuch. Indeed, according to our Author, She muſt ſay ſo; * *Unleſs She will allow Salvation*

* *Ibid.*

to

to Persons who deny any part of the Word of God, when it is declar'd to them that it is the Word of God by sufficient Authority. Instead of, *when it is declar'd,* &c. *by sufficient Authority,* put, *when it is prov'd by sufficient Evidence,* and the Persons themselves are, or ought to be, convinc'd by it; put it so, I say; and the Church of *England* will certainly not allow Salvation, in the ordinary Way, to such Persons: Yet She may, very consistently with herself, not absolutely damn all those, to whom, without their Fault, That Evidence may not appear, and who' therefore are not convinced by it. * *And yet* (continues He) *the above-said Article refers us to the Judgment of the Church, and not to Scriptures themselves (which indeed would be absurd) to learn what Books are Canonical.* So it may, without any *Inconsistency,* as I have shewn. † *And what is This, but making Tradition the only Rule of distinguishing betwixt inspir'd, and uninspir'd Writings? That is, the only Rule of a very important Article of Christian Faith.* Not the *only* Rule; tho *a* Rule: because there is *internal* Evidence, as well as *external.* But not to insist upon That; I tell him once more, we own *Tradition* is a very good Rule in many Cases, and This is one of them: But this Point, tho' a most important

* *Ibid.* and P. 49. † P. 49.

Truth

Truth, is not a moſt important *Article of Faith*, nor *any* Article of Faith at all.

* He *ſays nothing* (he tells us) *of the groſs Miſtake imply'd in Thoſe Words of the above-ſaid Article*; to wit, "*of whoſe Authority* "*was never any doubt in the Church*; inſtancing in ſome Books of Scripture received by Us as Canonical, *which* he ſays *were doubted of by eminent Men in the Church, even till the end of the fourth Century.* For a full and ſatisfactory Anſwer to this Objection, I alledge the Words of a learned Writer of our Church. † "The Reaſon of our rejecting them (the Books which we account *Apocryphal*) is, becauſe they were not "receiv'd as Canonical by the ancient "Church; whereas the ancient Church did "unanimouſly receive thoſe which we now "receive. I do not ſay that there was never "a Man, eſpecially among the Hereticks, "that doubted of, or even rejected, ſome of "Thoſe that we receive. But I ſay, that "the *main Body of Orthodox Chriſtians* "did always receive Thoſe Books which "we receive; when once they *became acquainted with them*, and had *Opportunity of examining into their Authority.* "Now the far greater Part of Theſe Books

---

* *Ibid.* † Dr. Bennets's Directions for ſtudying, &c. P. 60, 61, 62.

were

" were thus univerſally receiv'd in the firſt " and ſecond Centuries; and Others that " were *at firſt* ſuſpected by ſome conſidera- " ble Bodies of Chriſtians, who were not *as* " *yet acquainted* with them, were, *after* " *Examination made*, receiv'd alſo by " Thoſe *very Bodies* of Chriſtians, and *ne-* " *ver after* either *rejected*, or even *ſuſpec-* " *ted* by them. When therefore the Ar- " ticle aſſerts, that there *never was any* " *Doubt in the Church* of the Authority " of Thoſe Books which we receive, and " approve as Canonical; it muſt be under- " ſtood in *a limited Senſe*, not *abſolutely*, " but *reſpectively*. There have been Doubts " concerning ſome of them; but ſo *few*, ſo " *ſhort*, ſo *ſmall*, ſo *inconſiderable*, that " *comparatively*, and with reſpect to the " *Greatneſs of the Church's Extent*, they " are *nothing*, and *none at all*. And in This " the *Papiſts*, as well as our firſt Reformers, " agreed. They well knew what Suſpicions " had been entertain'd in ſome Churches for " a time concerning ſome Books which we re- " ceive, upon the Account before-mentioned; " and what Doubts ſome particular Men " have expreſs'd in their Writings concern- " ing them. And yet both our Reformers, " and the Papiſts, did allow that Thoſe Books " which we admit into the Canon were " never doubted of in the Church. But in " what Senſe? Why, They were never

" doubted

" doubted of, when once known, [*i. e.* when the Evidence of their Genuineneſs appear'd] " by the Church in general, or even by " any conſiderable Part of That diffuſive " Body. This Therefore was infallibly the " Meaning of the Compilers of our Arti- " cles; and They muſt be underſtood in " This Senſe. What is comparatively none " they muſt be ſuppos'd here to call none " at all; as we often do in common Con- " verſation, and all ſorts of Writings. And " if This be the Senſe of this Article (as " it manifeſtly is) 'tis certainly a ſound, and " a true one."

Our Author concludes This Section by aſſerting, * that *the Canon both of the old and new Teſtament was ſettled upon the ſame footing about the end of the fourth Century, as it has been ſince by the Council of* TRENT. This is a groſs and notorious falſhood in Fact: The Council of *Trent*, as 'tis ridiculouſly call'd, (for it does not deſerve the Name ſo much as of a *Council*, much leſs of a *General* one) with moſt audacious Impiety, added many Books to the Canon of Scripture, which were not receiv'd in the Church, as Canonical, about the End of the fourth Century, nor for twice four Centuries after, nor indeed

* *P.* 49.

at

at all, in any Age, by any Church, not the Church of *Rome* itſelf; * 'till That ſhameleſs Cabal, a few of the Pope's Creatures at *Trent*, about 250 Years ago, aſſuming to Themſelves the Title of a General Council, † declared Thoſe Books to be Part of God's Word; *ſcattering their Firebrands, Arrows, and Death*, like the Madman in the Proverbs, curſing, and ſending to Hell, all who ſhould dare to ſay otherwiſe.

I think I have given a full Anſwer to what our Author has advanc'd upon This great Article, *the Rule of Faith.* I conclude, by deſiring the Reader *ever to remember*, 1ſt. That what the *Papiſts* drive at under this Head (and indeed under almoſt all their general ones, as *Infallibility, Catholiciſm, Church-Authority*, &c.) is to make Their Church *Judge in her own Cauſe.*

---

* See This prov'd in Biſhop *Coſin*'s Scholaſtical Hiſtory of the Canon of Scripture; a Book (among many others) which no Papiſt ever *pretended* to anſwer.

† Whereas *at firſt* there were but *twenty* to make up This Aſſembly: *never* ſo many as *fifty*; Of Theſe not one from the *Greek* Church; not one from *England*, (in a publick Character;) not one from the *Helvetian*, *German*, and *Northern* Churches; but two from *France*, five from *Spain*, one from *Illyricum*, all the reſt *Italians*. Of whom again ſome were the *Pope's Penſioners*; ſome merely *Titular*, ſome wretchedly illiterate, &c. And This is Their *Oecumenical* or *General* Council, (for ſo 'tis expreſly ſtil'd) repreſentative of all *Chriſtendom.* This Impudence alone, if there were nothing elſe, is enough to ruin the Cauſe of Popery with all reaſonable Perſons.

2dly.

2dly. That ſuppoſing what They ſay about *unwritten Apoſtolical Traditions* in general were true and to the purpoſe, as I have ſhewn it not to be; yet ſtill *Thoſe* in particular which *They* put upon us for *Apoſtolical* are not *proved* to *be* ſo: Nay, we can *prove* that *moſt* of them are *not* ſo. Becauſe They are *contrary* to *Scripture*; which is allow'd on all Hands to be APOSTOLICAL.

To the Seventh SECTION;

Of *Scriptures*, and *Church-Authority.*

TO the Young Gentleman's Queſtion, * *how comes it that* Proteſtants are *ſo zealous for the Scriptures*, and yet *ſo little regard Church-Authority, ſince without That Authority we ſhould not even be ſure of the Scriptures themſelves*; *I anſwer*, 1ſt. The Suppoſition is falſe; We *have* a *due Regard* for Church-Authority. 2*dly*. Here is the old Quibble upon the Word *Authority*, and the old Sophiſtry about *Church* and *Scriptures*; of which more than enough has

---

* *P.* 49.

been ſaid already: Particularly, P. 9, 10. to which I refer.

His *Preceptor* indeed anſwers very differently. * *'Tis very hard* (ſays He) *to give a Reaſon for the Proceedings of Men, when they are once*, &c. And ſo on, againſt *Prejudice*, and *Self-Intereſt*. Then it follows Thus. † *The Reform'd Churches, as you obſerve*, affect *a wonderful Zeal for Scriptures, and* pretend *to make them the whole Rule of their Faith. And would not any one now imagine to find them the moſt zealous People in the World, for every thing the Scriptures recommend?*

G. *I ſhould really think ſo.*

P. *But, Sir, it is not a Proteſtant Virtue to ſpeak, or act coherently, in Religious Matters. You have already had ſome Specimens of their true Zeal for Scriptures in rejecting the Doctrines of* Infallibility, *and* Oral Tradition, *tho' eſtabliſh'd by ſuch* ſtrong *Scriptural Texts*, &c. *I ſhall now give you another Specimen of it, in their Oppoſition to Church-Authority; tho' it has likewiſe the plaineſt Teſtimonies of Scriptures to recommend it.* I ask This Writer in the firſt Place, whether he does not from his Heart believe, that our Zeal for the Scriptures is more than *affected*, or *pretended*? nay, whe-

---

* † *Ibid.* P. 50.

ther

ther he is not ſatisfy'd that Ours for the *Scriptures* is as *ſincere*, as Theirs is for their *Church* and *Traditions*? And if ſo; I ask him another Queſtion; with *what Conſcience* could he put Thoſe Words upon us? But how does it appear, that we are not *zealous for every thing the Scriptures recommend*? Why partly becauſe we reject the Doctrines of *Infallibility*, and *oral Tradition*; for which there are ſuch *ſtrong* Scriptural Texts. *How* ſtrong they are, we have ſeen; and the Reader, if he does not remember it, is deſir'd to look back upon the Examination of the three foregoing Sections. Now our Author is giving *another Specimen* of our no Regard to Scripture: *viz.* in our *oppoſition to Church-Authority*. And I take notice of This, as *another Specimen* of his ſingular *Modeſty*; Concerning which ſee P. 79. The Texts he produces * to prove the Authority we are ſaid to oppoſe, are *Matth.* xvi. 16. *Matth.* xxviii. 18, 19, 20. *Matth.* xviii. 17. *John* xx. 21. *Luke* x. 16. *Acts* xx. 18. *Heb.* xiii. 17. *Eph.* iv. 11, 12, 13, 14. Moſt of Theſe Texts have been produc'd by him, and conſider'd by me, already: Some upon This ſame Subject of *Church-Authority*; Others upon That of *Infallibility*. What I ſaid Before † of *two* of them, I now ſay of

* P. 50, 51, 52. † P. 6.

them *all*; That they prove no more than *ſuch* an Authority in the Church, as *We* allow, not ſuch a one as our *Romiſh* Adverſaries contend for: There is not a Word about an Authority in it, which *muſt* be *implicitly* and *abſolutely* ſubmitted to. If our Author *did not* intend to prove *ſuch* an Authority, he intended to prove nothing to the Purpoſe; If he *did*, he might as well have tranſcrib'd the whole Bible, as Theſe Texts. Let the Reader conſider them at his leiſure; and remember that I *inſiſt* upon This as a *fall* Anſwer to the Argument drawn from them. Our Saviour *gave Paſtors*, and *Teachers*, &c. *Epheſ.* iv. 11. *Ergo*, The Church (the Church of *Rome*) muſt be *implicitly believ'd*, and *obey'd*; whatever She *ſays*, or *commands*. And ſo of all the reſt.

* Speaking of the Paſtors of the Church, and explaining Thoſe Words, *that we be no more like Children, carry'd to and fro*, &c. *it belongs to theſe Guides*, ſays He, *to fix the wavering Judgments of the People*, &c. True; to fix them, *if they can*; or to do what they can *towards* it: But what if ſome *wavering Judgments* will not be fix'd *by* them? The *Infallible Church* her ſelf has not yet fix'd them *all*. If She had; there

---

* P. 52.

would

would not be ſuch a Variety of Opinions, ſo many Diſputes, ſo many Self-Contradictions, among *her Members*, as there ever have been, and ſtill are. But whatever *belongs to Theſe Guides*; it does *not* belong to them (at leaſt it *ought* not) to impoſe Lies, falſe Doctrine, and Nonſenſe upon Mankind, as the Papiſts do, even in order to the *fixing* of their *wavering Judgments*.

From what has been ſaid may be collected, that his Aſſertion in the next Paragraph * is a Calumny upon the *firſt Reformers*: They did not *reject the Authority* which the Scripture *expreſly recommends*, by rejecting *ſuch* an Authority as the Church of *Rome* arrogates to herſelf. The *Railing*, and *malicious Reflections* which follow, I paſs over, as immaterial.

P. 53. G. *But are not the firſt Reformers, and their Followers, as poſitively condemn'd by their own Rule, I mean the Scriptures, as by the Authority of the Catholick Church?* Yes; much at one. We put the whole Iſſue of our Cauſe upon *Scripture*, and the *Catholick Church*; and have proved a thouſand times that *They*, not *We*, are condemn'd by Both. † *And why then have they ſo great a Spleen againſt the one, and ſhew ſo great a Reſpect for the other?*

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

P. *The Reaſon in ſhort is, becauſe the Church is ſomewhat harder to be manag'd than the Scripture*: And ſo on, to the Middle of the next Page. The Subſtance of what is here alledg'd by This Writer, and the Author of *the Rule of Faith* quoted by him, is This: That the *dead Letter* of the Scripture cannot *ſpeak for it ſelf*, nor *explain its own Meaning*, and ſo any body may ſafely *torture*, and *abuſe* it; but 'tis quite otherwiſe with the *Church*, who is a *living Judge*. And This is the Reaſon, why Proteſtants have ſuch a *Spleen againſt Church-Authority*, &c. Proteſting, once more, that the *Fact* is not true, and abſolutely denying that we *have* ſuch a *Spleen*, as is here ſuppos'd; upon thoſe Words, * *an Infallible Rule* (*as Scriptures doubtleſs are*, WHEN RIGHTLY UNDERSTOOD) *without an Infallible Interpreter, puts little or no Reſtraint*, &c. *but an Infallible Interpreter*, &c. I obſerve, *1ſt.* The Suppoſition is groundleſs; The Church is *not* Infallible, and there is *no* Infallible Interpreter; as We have prov'd. *2dly.* To affirm that the Scriptures, tho' complimented with the Name of an *Infallible Rule when rightly underſtood*, cannot be *rightly underſtood* without an *Infallible Interpreter*, is to make them utterly uſeleſs, and good for nothing. If This be the Caſe; to what pur-

* *Ibid.*

poſe

poſe were they *written*? Why could not God from time to time reveal his Will to his Infallible Church *without Writing*, as well as make it Infallible in explaining what is *Written*? Is it not as eaſy (or rather much eaſier) to reveal a Thing once for all, than to reveal the Senſe of what was written by Revelation, and yet cannot be underſtood without another Revelation? But we have more of This *Blaſphemy* afterwards. The *dead Letter of the Scriptures*, That profane Cant of *Papiſts* and *Quakers*, is an Expreſſion twice made uſe of in the Compaſs of a few Lines. And what is meant by it? That the *Ink* and *Characters* are not *alive*, cannot *ſpeak*, or do not *underſtand* the Senſe contain'd in them? This is Childiſh, and Trifling. Or, that the Holy Ghoſt *could* not, or *would not*, have his Meaning expreſs'd intelligibly? This is Blaſphemy. If They ſay, the Latter [he *would not*] is no Blaſphemy; becauſe he has appointed an Infallible Expounder, to make it intelligible: I anſwer, 1*ſt*. The abovementioned Inconvenience recurs. According to This, the Scripture is uſeleſs; God does That *per plura*, which may much better be done *per pauciora*; He acts *ſuperfluouſly*, by conſequence *abſurdly*: And to ſay That is *flaming Blaſphemy*. 2dly. This their Account of the matter ſuppoſes, that the divinely inſpired Writings would be unin-

telligible, without an Infallible Interpreter; and that there is none, We have prov'd: Therefore the Blasphemy remains. The same, in effect, may be said of That fine Stroke of His; * *Tho' It* (the *dead Letter* of Scripture) *be never so much put to the Torture; it cannot complain, nor make any farther Discoveries, nor give us any farther Lights,* THAN THE SACRED PENMEN THOUGHT FIT TO COMMUNICATE TO US IN THEIR WRITINGS. As if Those were not enough; nay, as if they were next to nothing, or rather nothing at all: For that is the real Case; as This Author and his Brethren represent it. And supposing it were true; how does *their Church enlighten* us in the understanding of the Scriptures? Do not *They* dispute about the Sense of them altogether as much as *We*? Are there not many Texts which They do not so much as pretend to understand? Or if it be otherwise; why does not This Infallible Church, once for all, publish to the World an entire Comment upon the Bible, so as to fix the Sense of every Word in it, and prevent all Disputes for the future? But alas! it has been always her Way not to *explain* what is *obscure*, but to *obscure* what is *plain*: This is the Use She has always made of her *Infallibility*.

---

* *Ibid.*

* *But the Infallible Interpreter, the Church*, he ſays, *is not ſo tame.* The Church which pretends to be *Infallible*, is, I confeſs, not very *tame:* Witneſs *Smithfield.* He goes on. † *So that if her Decrees be call'd in Queſtion; She can exert her Power, and ſtand up in Defence of them.* POWER indeed is a material Point; and the Church of *Rome* has made a *thorough* uſe of it; but it is not always accompanied with Truth, Right, and a good Cauſe. *This* ſort of *Power*, I grant, the Scriptures have not; tho' they are in another ſenſe very *powerful.* To ſhew, farther, the great Superiority of their Church over the Scriptures (for we are ſtill upon the ſame *Blaſphemy* as Before) *She*, we are told, ‖ *is a living Interpreter; and, if her Words be miſinterpreted, can do herſelf Juſtice, by explaining her own true Meaning:* Whereas the poor helpleſs Scriptures are not able to explain Theirs. The Bible, it is true, is not *alive*; And if it be *tortur'd*, as He wiſely obſerves, it cannot *cry out.* But notwithſtanding Theſe, and ſuch like Sayings, it is a very good and ſufficient *Rule*; ſince (God having given common Reaſon to the Bulk of Mankind) it is *in the main* capable of being *underſtood* by *ordinary* Capacities: And as it may

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‖ *P.* 54.

be

be tortur'd, and miſapply'd, by Some; ſo it may be, and actually is, *well us'd*, and *duly apply'd*, by Others. Nor can we infer that becauſe it is *capable* of being *miſapply'd*, therefore it is no true Rule; if That were a Conſequence, there would be *no* true Rule in the World.

Neither has the *living*, and pretended *Infallible Church*, any Advantage over the *dead* Scriptures (as the Quakers and Papiſts call them; λόγια ζῶντα, *living Oracles*, St. *Stephen* and We Proteſtants call them) even in reſpect of *explaining*, and *vindicating* its own *Meaning*. For, 1ſt. Is a *General Council* to be ſummon'd upon every perverſe, or ignorant Creature's miſrepreſenting, or miſunderſtanding the Church's Senſe? Or even upon occaſion of the Ignorance, or Perverſeneſs of great Numbers? The Thing is manifeſtly impoſſible. At this rate, We muſt have a *General Council* at leaſt once a Quarter: For no Council leſs than a General one is pretended to be *Infallible*; or to deſerve the Name of the *Church*. Beſides; 2dly. As Thoſe *who believe not* Moſes *and the* Prophets, *will not be perſwaded, tho' one roſe from the Dead*; ſo Thoſe who cannot, or will not, underſtand the neceſſary Doctrines of Scripture, which are ſufficiently intelligible to the meaneſt Capacity, cannot, or will not, in the ſame perverſe Humour, underſtand any thing elſe. The Church then

then defines This, or That; Theſe People miſinterpret her Words: She explains her Meaning; Thoſe who were ignorant, or obſtinate Before, continue ſo ſtill; wanting an Explanation of the Explanation; and ſo on *in Infinitum*. Is not This a palpable Abſurdity? Cannot a *living* Man's Senſe be miſrepreſented, or miſapply'd, as well as a *dead* one's? Or *Man's* as well as *God's*? The Truth is, the Vanity of That Notion, an *Infallible Judge* to *determine Controverſies*, will appear in *any Light*; or on *whatever Side* it be conſider'd. Suppoſing there *were* ſuch a one, as there is *Not*; He would not certainly determine Controverſies, and quaſh Hereſies. 1*ſt*. Becauſe he *might be* Infallible; and yet by Many not *believ'd* ſo. For, I hope, our Adverſaries themſelves will not affirm, that the Arguments to prove him ſo are *ſelf-evident*, and *irreſiſtible*. Or if they will; I think I have at leaſt ſhewn the Contrary to *That*. 2*dly*. He might be *believ'd* Infallible; and yet not *obey'd*. How many believe the Scriptures to be God's Word; and, notwithſtanding, act contrary to them? 3*dly*. They might either ignorantly, or wilfully, miſunderſtand his Deciſions; which is what we are now conſidering. Upon the Whole; the *Apoſtles*, and among the Reſt St. *Peter* Himſelf, could not, in their own time, hinder or ſuppreſs all Hereſies: And I ſuppoſe None of their Succeſſors are *more Infallible Guides*

Guides than They. It may perhaps be objected, that this Reaſoning will as well prove that the *Scriptures* are not an *Infallible Guide*. I anſwer, They are not indeed; nor was it ever intended they ſhould be; ſo as to *neceſſitate* Men to be *de facto infallibly guided* by them: Tho' they are *in themſelves* infallibly *true*, and a *ſufficient Rule* to Thoſe who make a *true Uſe* of them.

The Leaders of the Reformation (He adds *) *hated the Church; and appeal'd from her Authority to the dead Letter of Scripture. They hated the Church, as Criminals hate the Judge, by whom they are ſure to be condemn'd.* Doubtleſs, They had no great Love for the Church of *Rome*, as corrupted; and were ſure enough to be condemn'd by *Her*. For the Reſt, I ſay; juſt ſo, and for That very Reaſon *Papiſts* hate the *Scriptures*. But then there is a mighty Diſparity between the two Aſſertions. To ſay *We hate the Church* (the *truly Catholick* Church) or are *condemn'd by her Judgment*, is falſe, and ſcandalous; as I have often been forced to plead. That *Papiſts* are *condemn'd by Scripture*, we have abundantly *prov'd*: And that They *hate* it, is evident; Becauſe, even while they are endeavouring to *ſave Appearances* by *pretend-*

* *Ibid.*

ing

ing to *honour* it, in ſpight of *Diſſimulation*, They cannot forbear *blaſpheming* it. He adds, * *And their appealing to Scriptures was, in effect, appealing to their* OWN *private Judgment.* Sir, there *muſt* be *private* Judgment; or there can be *no* Judgment at all. Common *Reaſon* neceſſarily *requires* it; *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles appeal* to it, and not only *permit*, but *command*, the Exerciſe of it; You *yourſelves* make *uſe* of it, and *force Us* to make *uſe* of it, even by your *arguing*, and diſputing *againſt* it. But why *was their Appealing to Scripture in effect appealing to their* OWN *private Judgment?* Becauſe of their *private Interpretations*, no Doubt; that is, They were ſo abſurd, and ſo wicked, as to make uſe of their *Reaſon*, in reading the *Scriptures.* But tho' they *us'd* their own private Judgment; yet they *appeal'd* not to That *only*, but to the *private Judgment* and common Senſe of *Every-body*, and to the *publick Judgment* of the truly *Catholick Church* likewiſe. *Where* (continues He †) *i. e.* in their own private Judgment, *they were as ſafe, as they could wiſh. For what Criminal would fear to appear before a Tribunal, where Himſelf ſits as Judge and Interpreter of the Law, by which he is to be try'd?* He cannot, I imagine, be conve-

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

niently,

niently at the *Bar*, and upon the *Bench*, at the *same time*: But however, I grant it is possible that a Man may be *Judge in his own Cause*; and Nothing can be more contrary to Reason, and Equity. But then This is the Case of Papists, not of Protestants. *They* are both Judges, and Witnesses in Their own Cause, as I have often shewn: But I have just now shewn that by *appealing* to the *Scriptures*, and *employing* our *Reason* in *reading* them, *We* are not so in Ours.

What follows in the next Words, *And indeed the World soon saw the Fruits*, &c. to the End of the first Paragraph in P. 56. is a *Declamation* upon the *Abuse of Scripture* by *Protestants*, and the various *Sects*, and *Divisions* among them, occasion'd by their being *permitted* to *read* Those sacred Writings. As he often repeats This doughty Argument; I shall chuse to pass it over Here, and consider it once for all, when I come to That Part of his Book, where he lays out his chief Strength upon it; *viz. Dial.* iv. Sect. 4. At present, I only observe, 1*st*. That to argue from the *Abuse* of a Thing against the *Use* of it, is That *silly Sophism*, call'd *Fallacia Accidentis*: According to which Argumentation, there is no *good*

* *Ibid*

Thing

Thing in the World; and *Religion* itſelf ought to be baniſh'd out of it. Muſt not a Man *drink Wine*, becauſe drinking *too much* of it will make him *drunk*? Muſt he not uſe a *Knife*, becauſe by *playing the fool* with it he may happen to *cut his fingers*? 2dly. Thoſe Words of His,* * *The written Word of God being wreſted out of the Hands of* ITS OWN LAWFUL INTERPRETER *the Catholick Church* (or, in other Words, the Church of *Rome*) *and ſeiz'd on by Theſe uſurping Intruders*, &c. contain a ſhameful and notorious Untruth, contrary to That very Word of God, to the Practice of the Primitive and truly Catholick Church, and to the firſt Principles of Reaſon. According to all which, every Chriſtian has a Right to read the Scriptures, and interpret them too, according to the beſt of his Skill, ſupplying the Defects of it, as well as he can, by the Aſſiſtance of others. 3*dly*. I do not underſtand how the Church of *England* ſent *their Repreſentatives* to the Synod of *Dort*. † The *Kings Commiſſion* did not, I think, make Thoſe who went thither the Church's Repreſentatives.

His next Aſſertion is a round one. ‖ *I conclude in the Whole, that Scriptures alone are ſo far from being a full, and compleat*

---

* *Ibid.* † *P.* 55. ‖ *P.* 56.

Rule

Rule of Chriſtian Faith; that they are NO RULE AT ALL: *at leaſt in any doubtful or diſputed Caſe; unleſs they be* INTERPRETED *by* THAT AUTHORITY *which Chriſt has eſtabliſhed upon Earth, to be our* GUIDE, *and to which he has promis'd his perpetual Aſſiſtance.* If That be the Caſe; they are in, and of *Themſelves*, good for nothing: And yet the Romaniſts acknowledge them to be divinely inſpir'd. This is the ſo often repeated *Blaſphemy* in yet ſtronger Expreſſions. It is directly exploding the Scriptures, and making them a pure Nullity without Their Church; For She, and She only, is the *Guide* they talk of. Without Her, according to This, They are a *dead Letter* indeed; mere *unſens'd Characters* (another profane Expreſſion of Theirs) having no Life, nor Soul, any farther than as She is pleas'd to *breathe* into them; no Senſe, or Meaning, any farther than as She is pleas'd to put one upon them: *At leaſt in doubtful, and diſputed Caſes*; and *every* Caſe ſhall be *ſo*, which She thinks fit to make ſo. If This be not ſetting Themſelves *above* Scripture, which they own to be the Word of God, and making it *abſolutely ſubject* to them; Their Language is as unintelligible, as they repreſent the Scriptures to be.

* *The Scriptures*, He ſays, *read without the Submiſſion and Deference which is due*

* *Ibid.*

to

the Guides appointed by Providence, to lead us into the true Meaning of them, have been the Cauſe of all the Diſputes that have divided whole Chriſtendom theſe two hundred laſt Years; but never put an End to any. Are there no Diſputes then among the Members of *Their* Church? It is well known there are a great Number. Is there *no* Cauſe of Diſputes, but Reading the Scriptures without That Deference which He ſuppoſes ſhould be paid to their Church? May not Ignorance, Pride, even human Infirmity, and the Imperfection of our preſent State, have a conſiderable ſhare in them; whether the Scriptures are read with the aforeſaid Deference, or not? And is He very ſure that the Scriptures, among us, never put an End to any Diſpute? I believe I could give him ſeveral Inſtances to the Contrary; but I will mention only *one*; if it may be call'd *One*, it being, in Truth, a *Cluſter* of *many*. The *Quinquarticular* Controverſy has long been quite extinct among us: And it was owing to *Scripture*, interpreted according to Scripture, and good Senſe, by ſeveral learned Church of *England* Divines, the great Biſhop *Bull* eſpecially.

* *For how*, He adds, *can That be a proper Means to end Diſputes, which, in all*

---

* *Ibid.*

Controversies that are to be decided by Scriptures, is itself the Principal Subject of the Dispute? Not so: It is not the *principal* Subject of the Dispute; it is only the *secondary*; and may very well be decided, if Men will be *wise*, and *honest*. If they will not; it is their own Fault, and They must answer for it. But as bad as the World is, there are some Men both Wise, and Honest; and Disputes have by Scripture duly apply'd been actually finish'd, and determin'd. * *'Tis impossible*, He subjoins, *the contending Parties should come to an Agreement* [about the Sense of Scripture] *unless they sacrifice their own private Judgments, and submit to a Tribunal from which there is no Appeal.* By *sacrificing* their private Judgments, it is evident, he means *implicitly resigning* up their Judgments, and making *no Use* of them. That they ought to do so, I deny; for the Reasons so often mention'd. An *external* Tribunal in These matters, from which there *ought to be* no Appeal, in *any Case* whatsoever, is not yet found; nor do they tell us *where* we may find it: The *Church* being a Word too indeterminate, and of too great Latitude; and They themselves not agreeing in what *Part* of the Church This *Tribunal* is plac'd. An *internal* one

* *P.* 57.

there

there is; and That is the Tribunal of right, unprejudic'd, well-inform'd Reaſon, and Conſcience; *To* which if we will *not* appeal, and *from* which if we *will* appeal; 'tis our own Fault, and Folly: and we muſt give an Account for it at the *ſupreme Tribunal* in *another World*. What the young Gentleman anſwers is the ſame, in other Words, which his Preceptor ſaid juſt Before. Speaking of Diſputes about the Senſe of Scripture, and from thence inferring the Neceſſity of a *Judge* to determine them, They Both ſeem to forget that there are great Diſputes about That Judge even among the Romaniſts Themſelves; about the *Pope*, the *Church*, and the *Infallibility* of Both. And therefore why the Scripture ſhould be *ſo uncertain* a *Rule*, (if it were at all an uncertain one, as I have ſhewn it is Not) and Their Church *ſo certain* a *Judge*; or why the Laſt mention'd may not be call'd * *the very Apple of Diſcord, and a Source of endleſs Diſputes*, at leaſt as well as the Other, I can by no means underſtand.

He concludes Thus. † *Suppoſe there were a Nation that ſhould give full Liberty to every one to interpret its Laws by his own private Judgment; would it be poſſible in that Caſe, to condemn any Criminal, or put*

* *P.* 56. † *P.* 57.

an end to any Law-suit? Nay, would not Anarchy and Confusion be the unavoidable Consequence of it? The matter will not bear a Dispute. And therefore there is not a civiliz'd Nation in the World, but has a supreme Tribunal establish'd from which there is no Appeal. Premising This Observation that *We* deny not, nay we expressly *assert*, and contend for, *an* Authority in the *Church*, in every *National* Church, as to Articles of Faith, and the Interpretation of Scripture, which Authority must be in a great measure submitted to; tho' not *absolutely*, and without *Appeal*, in any Case whatsoever: *i. e.* She must not be submitted to, if her Decisions be *manifestly* erroneous, and impious: I say, premising This, I answer, 1*st*. Every one may, without Absurdity, barely interpret even human Laws, as far as he is able, by his own private Judgment; nor is it in the Power of his Governours to hinder him. But if by interpreting them be meant (as it must, if any thing to the purpose be meant) interpreting them in his *own* Cause, or expecting that his *Judges* should *abide* by *his* Interpretation; there never was, nor ever will be, one single private Person, foolish enough to think of any such thing. To make a Supposition therefore that a Nation should *grant* to *every one*, what *no one* can be conceiv'd to *desire*, is extremely weak, and trifling. And the same, by the Bye, may

be

be ſaid of private Judgment in *Religious* matters. 2*dly*. From the Neceſſity of an external *ſupreme Tribunal*, to which an *abſolute* Submiſſion is due, as to *temporal Affairs*, cannot be inferr'd the Neceſſity of ſuch a one in this World, as to matters of Religion, and Conſcience. 'Tis neceſſary that there ſhould be ſuch a Tribunal *in* This World, with reſpect to the Things *of* it: With regard to Thoſe of the Next, God has given us an *Internal ſupreme Tribunal*, even in This World, as above-obſerv'd; and there is another, an external one, in the Next, before which we ſhall be condemn'd, if we do not make a right Uſe of That juſt now mention'd, which he has given us in This. 3*dly*. This Reaſoning ſuppoſes that 'tis *as neceſſary* there ſhould be an *abſolute judicial* Determination of *Controverſies* in Religion, as that *Civil Crimes* ſhould be puniſh'd, and *Law-ſuits* determin'd; than which nothing can be more groundleſs. Human Society cannot ſubſiſt without the Latter, but it very well may without the Former. A Man may at any time *hold* his own *private Opinion*, without Prejudice, or Injuſtice to Another who differs from him; but the ſame cannot be ſaid of *holding an Eſtate*: And as to *Criminal Caſes*, the Matter is plain of itſelf. Or if Diſputes in Religion come to diſturb the Peace of the State, as I grant they *may*, tho' it is not *neceſſary* they *ſhould*;

the *Civil Powers* may, and ought to reſtrain Thoſe *Diſorders* which are the *Conſequences* of them; There is no occaſion of recurring to any other Tribunal; Or rather there *is* no other, before which ſuch Diſorders are cognizable. 4*thly*. As the ſupreme Tribunal in the State does not *put an end* to Robbery, Murder, and going to Law; ſo neither would ſuch a one in the Church, if there were one, put an end to Errors, and Controverſies: Unleſs it could firſt put an End to all human *Corruption*, and *Infirmity*. As one Diſpute ſhould be determin'd; another, or perhaps the ſame in another Shape, would ſtart up: and the univerſal infallible Judge in Spirituals would have as much Buſineſs upon his Hands, as the fallible ones in Temporals. 5*thly*. There *is* in *Fact* ſuch a ſupreme Tribunal in all Civil States; but *not* in the Church, as We have prov'd. And ſince God has not *appointed* one, it is not neceſſary there ſhould *be* one. To which we may add from * Mr. *Chillingworth*. 6thly. *In civil Controverſies we are oblig'd only to external, paſſive Obedience; but not to internal and active. But in matters of Religion ſuch a Judge is required* [according to Papiſts] *whom we ſhould be obliged to believe to have judg'd right*. And to

* *Chap.* 2. n. 17. 19.

be

be *oblig'd* to *believe* a thing, I add, is neither *reaſonable*, nor *poſſible*. 7thly. *In civil Controverſies the Caſe cannot be put ſo, but there may be a Judge to end it, who is not a Party: In Controverſies of Religion, it is in a manner impoſſible to be avoided but the Judge muſt be a Party. For this muſt be the Firſt, whether he be a Judge, or no; and in That he muſt be a Party. The Pope* (and the ſame may be ſaid of the Church of *Rome*) is manifeſtly a *Party* in *This very* Caſe.

In ſhort, God has furniſh'd us with Means ſufficient to *know*, and *do* our Duty, both in *Faith* and *Practice*, without an *Infallible* Judge, or *any* Judge, from whom, *whatever* he determines, there can be *no Appeal*; For *That* is what our Adverſaries aim at: *Some* Church-Authority in *Theſe* Matters, and a great deal too, *We* acknowledge, as well as *They*. Or if there were ſuch an Authority, ſuch a Tribunal, as They contend for; it would not bring That *Peace upon Earth*, which They imagine. Neither has God any more provided Means which ſhall *neceſſarily* put an end to all *Errors*, and *Diſputes*, than to all *Vice*. Nor is it fit he ſhould. The *Will* is left free; our *Underſtandings* are imperfect: And as long as ſo many Men are *weak*, and *wicked*; there will be a Poſſibility of *Hereſies*, and *Schiſms*, as well as of other *Sins*.

To the Eighth Section.

THIS, to my great Refreſhment, is Entitled *A Recapitulation of the foregoing Sections.* It is therefore anſwer'd already: And let Him recapitulate what he pleaſes, I will recapitulate Nothing; having been long ſince ſufficiently tired with *Tautology.* I ſhall only remark upon two, or three Sentences, which are not included in the aforeſaid Recapitulation.

P. 58. *Some time after his Reſurrection he committed the Charge of his* WHOLE *Flock in a ſpecial manner to St.* Peter. John xxi. *v.* 15. *&c.* That *my Sheep* implies ALL *my Sheep*, He *ſuppoſes*; and I *deny:* And That's Anſwer enough. Nor did our Saviour commit *any* Sheep in *an eſpecial manner* to St. *Peter*, more than to the reſt of the Apoſtles; Tho' He particularly applies himſelf to Him, *Loveſt thou me*, &c? becauſe St. *Peter* had *deny'd* Him, which no other Apoſtle had done.

P. 59. —— *As is atteſted by St.* Paul, *in his Epiſtle to the* Romans, Chap. i. *v.* 8. *which was written but fifteen Years after St.* Peter's *coming to* Rome. In all probability, and according to the beſt Accounts, it was written many Years *before* St. *Peter* came to

to *Rome*. * Not that This is, either way, material to our preſent Controverſy.

P. 65. G. *Sir, You have given me a full and clear Idea of the Authority of the Church*, &c. In ſhort, the young Gentleman is ready to burſt with Conviction, and Satisfaction; upon Evidence, which I hope I have prov'd to be no Evidence at all. *But ſince*, ſays He, *there are a great number of Churches —all pretending to be* THE *true Church —how is This Church to be found?* &c. This is repeated in the next Dialogue; In the Examination of which, and elſewhere, it ſhall be thoroughly conſider'd.

---

* See Dr. *Cave's* Life of St. *Peter*, and St. *Paul*.

AN

ANSWER

TO A

Popish BOOK,

ENTITLED,

ENGLAND's *Conversion and Reformation compar'd*, &c.

To The Second DIALOGUE:

Containing (as it's Title sets forth) *A brief Historical Account of the Conversion of the* Britons, *and* Saxons; *with* Proofs *of their Agreement in* Faith; *and some Remarks upon Circumstances relating to the Conversion of the* Saxons.

HAT our Author attempts in This Second Dialogue, is to shew that the Religion of the *present* Church of *Rome* is the *very same* with That to which King *Ethelbert* and his *Saxons* were converted by

by *Auſtin* the Monk, and the other Miſſionaries of Pope *Gregory* the Great, at the End of the 6th Century: Which was the *ſame* with That to which King *Lucius*, and his *Britons* were converted by the Miſſionaries of Pope *Eleutherius*, in the 2d Century: Which muſt needs be the true genuine Chriſtianity; the Church of *Rome* being on all hands confeſs'd to have been *Then* uncorrupt: From whence it follows, that what is at preſent injuriouſly traduced by the *Nickname* of *Popery*, is indeed the *true genuine Chriſtianity*. I think I have collected the ſcatter'd Parts of his Argument, and put it all together, in a ſtronger, and clearer Light, than He himſelf has any where done: And a clear Anſwer ſhall be given to it in the Sequel. But before he comes to the main Point, He gives us two Sections by Way of Introduction.

To The firſt SECTION:

ENTITULED,

The Importance of Enquiring into the Marks *of the* True Church *of* Chriſt; *in which alone Salvation is prov'd to be poſſible.*

ACCORDING to his Cuſtom, he ſets out upon a *falſe Suppoſition*; taking it for granted that * *the great Number of Churches in the World, tho' differing from one another, pretend* ALL *to be* THE *true Church of Chriſt.* I hope ALL is uſed *diſtributively*, for *Every one*; Otherwiſe, I doubt, 'tis neither good *Senſe*, nor *Grammar*. However it be, the Propoſition is notoriouſly untrue; No Church upon Earth, but That of *Rome*, pretends to be *the* true Church: All the reſt conſider the Difference between *A* and *The*; and are neither ſo *ſtupid*, nor ſo *fraudulent*, as to confound them with each other.

That which follows about † *Chriſtian Church, true Church, Catholick Church, and a particular Church's being united with,*

---

* *P.* 66. † *P.* 67.

or

or ſeparated from, the Catholick Church, &c. is very dark and confus'd, to my Apprehenſion. Were it well look'd into; I believe there would be found but little *Senſe*, or little *Truth* in it: But as it affects not the Main of our Cauſe, nor do I underſtand what Uſe our Author makes of it, I paſs it over: Only obſerving Thus much, that *Catholick* Church, and the Church of *Rome*, ſeem to be confounded; and that there ſeems to be an Equivoque in the Word *true* as apply'd to Church; Both which Pieces of Chicanery we have often noted.

What he ſays * concerning the great *Importance* of enquiring into the *Marks* of the *true Church*, &c. and People's *Negligence* in *not* enquiring into them, as they ſhould do, amounts to Thus much. *Examine yourſelves, whether ye be in the Faith*, 2 Cor. xiii. 5. And *what is a man profited, if he ſhall gain the whole World, and loſe his own Soul?* Matth. xvi. 26. Doctrines, I acknowledge, of the *utmoſt Importance*; and, in requital of our Author's Kindneſs, I return them to him, heartily recommending the ſerious Conſideration of them to Himſelf, and the *Roman* Catholicks in general; for None want it more; and earneſt-

* *P.*68 &c. to 72.

ly

ly beſeeching God, that both *We*, and *They*, may have Grace to *practiſe* them.

This Gentleman would not have been at ſo much Pains to prove that there can be * *no Salvation* but in the *true Church*; did he not take it for granted, that the Church of *Rome* only *is* That *Church*: Which he muſt needs know We do not acknowledge. For the reſt, what he diſcourſes about the *Impoſſibility* of *Salvation* to Thoſe who are *not* Members of the true Church, and our allowing a *Poſſibility* of their being *ſav'd*, is partly *Calumny*, and partly *Miſtake*, or *Miſrepreſentation*. The Church of *England* is no *Latitudinarian* upon This Subject; as ſufficiently appears from her 18th Article. But we may very conſiſtently with That Article, with Reaſon, and with Scripture, *allow a Poſſibility of Salvation*, (Salvation in the ſtricteſt Senſe, and according to the Covenant of Grace) *to Chriſtians*, † *whatever Church, or Communion they are of, ſo they live moral Lives*, &c. according to the beſt of their Knowledge; and provided their Knowledge be the beſt they can obtain. Nay, we may very conſiſtently with all three, ‡ *extend our Charity even to Heathens, and Mahometans*; ſo far as to allow *that They may be ſav'd by an uncovenanted*

---

* *P.* 68 71, 72. † *P.* 69. ‡ *Ibid.*

Mercy:

Mercy: Meaning by *ſav'd*, in ſome meaſure *rewarded*, tho' They have certainly no *Right* to the *Chriſtian Salvation*. Moſt of what our Author urges to the contrary from Scriptures, Fathers, and Biſhop *Pearſon*, may be ſolv'd by applying the Diſtinction juſt now mention'd, between *Covenanted*, and *Uncovenanted*, being *ſav'd* according to the *Chriſtian Diſpenſation*, and being in *ſome Degree rewarded*. But his Argument from *Gal.* i. 8. is very ſingular. * *St.* Paul *lays his Curſe even upon an Angel from Heaven, if he ſhould preach any other Goſpel*, or Faith, *than That which he himſelf had preach'd*. That is, Becauſe no Faith, but the true, is to be *preach'd*; THEREFORE Nobody can, in any Senſe, be *poſſibly ſav'd* without *having* it *preach'd* to him. An admirable Conſequence!

In the next Paragraph, from *Heathens* and *Mahometans* he returns to *Chriſtians*. † *The ſame Apoſtle tells us, that as we are call'd to one Hope, one Lord, and one Baptiſm, ſo to* ONE FAITH. Eph. 4. v. 5. *And he aſſures us likewiſe, that without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God*, Heb. 11. v. 6. *Now theſe two Texts join'd together make up a demonſtrative Proof that there is but one Church, or Communion, in which Sal-*

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

vation

vation is poſſible. Not ſo very demonſtrative; becauſe the Word *Faith* does not ſignify the ſame thing in both Texts. In the former, it means by a *Metonymy*, the *Object* of our *Faith*, the Doctrine of the Goſpel; in the latter, it means the *Belief of*, or more properly the *Aſſent to*, Theſe Truths, that *God is*, and that *he is a Rewarder of Thoſe who diligently ſeek him.* He purſues his Argument Thus. * *For if there be but one Faith* (*and who can doubt it?*) *it follows that among the many Churches, which all teach different Faiths, there can be but one which teaches the Faith St.* Paul *ſpeaks of; which is undoubtedly the true one.* Undoubtedly it is: But then You talk, as if there were as many *Faiths* in the World as there are *Churches*; or as if every *different Church* had a *different Goſpel.* A moſt vain, and groundleſs Suppoſition! Thoſe who *differ* from one another in *many* things, may have, and actually have, the *one true Faith* in the main: Even *Papiſts* have it, tho' with ſpurious Additions; as *We* have it, without any. The Remainder of the Paragraph is anſwer'd of courſe, by what has been ſaid.

His abuſing Biſhop *Pearſon* † for adhering to the Church of *England*, out of *Intereſt*

---

* *Ibid.*

and *Prejudice*, I pass over; because I have promis'd to make no more Remarks upon his *Declamations* of That Kind. But his malicious Slanders, and insolent Reflections, upon *all our Bishops* in general, shall be taken notice of in a more proper Place: I mean in the Examination of his *Third Dialogue*, which is made up of *Scandal*, and little else.

* He concludes by inferring, that *it behoves us, as we tender our Salvation, to examine—by what Marks we may clearly know This one true Church.* Very well then; Let us have *your* Marks: We have had *Bellarmine's* long ago; And such a *Mark* has been *set upon them* by several Learned Divines of our Church as will not easily be wip'd off.

---

* *P.* 72

To

To The Second SECTION:

ENTITULED,

Neither Education, *nor* Intereſt, *are to be conſulted in the choice of our Religion.*

IN This Section (to what end it was *made* a *Section*, or at all *inſerted*, I no more underſtand, than I do how the *Title* of it came to be *falſe Grammar*) we have little more than a Repetition of the ſo often repeated Harangue, upon the noble Subject of *Intereſt*, and *Prejudice*.

This continnes for * ſeveral Pages; and, it being more than once anſwer'd already, I ſhall only remark upon a few Sentences in Thoſe Pages, with a view to ſomething elſe.

P. 73. *But This* [viz. To be *ſatisfy'd* with *any* Religion, *only* becauſe we were *educated* in it] *is as irrational, as if any one ſhould argue Thus: I have got the Leproſy, or King's Evil of my Parents, therefore I ought to reſt content with it, and not*

* P. 72, 73, 74, 75, 76.

give my Self the trouble of seeking after Remedies for my Cure. So say I too: And would to God the *Papists* would duly consider it, and practically apply it to *Themselves.* If They did; the *Leprosy,* or *King's Evil* of *Popery* would not be so reigning, and epidemical, as it is.

P. 74. To prove the Impossibility of Salvation to Those who have not the true Faith, he alledges, *Mark* xvi. 16. *He that believeth not shall be condemn'd.* That is, if it be his own Fault that he believeth not: Which was the Case of Those Unbelievers, to whom the Apostles working Miracles preach'd; and of whom our Saviour here speaks; as appears from the Context both Before, and After.

Ibid. *But is their Desire to find the Truth as hearty, and sincere,* &c. *Are they ready to imitate the courageous Virtue of* Toby, *who, when all flock'd to the Golden Calves set up by* Jeroboam, *separated himself from the Communion of his Fellow-Citizens and went alone up to the Temple at* Jerusalem, &c? This was exactly the Case of our *first Reformers*: But the Church of *England* has no *golden Calves*; nor any other *golden Images* to *worship,* as the Church of *Rome* has; nor any *abominable Corruption* whatsoever, as the Church of *Rome* has a thousand.

P. 75.

P. 75. His Reflection upon our *perſecuting Laws*, as He calls them, might well have been omitted; for a *Reaſon*, which ſhall be conſider'd in due time, and place.

Having done with *Self-Intereſt*, and *Prejudice*, for the preſent, He advances to ſomething which *looks* like ſomething to the Purpoſe. * *If You can fully convince me*, ſays the Young Gentleman, *that all the Marks of the true Church of Chriſt belong ſo wholly, and ſolely to the Church of* Rome, [Ay, prove *That*, ſay I] *that they cannot with any Appearance of Truth be appropriated to the Church of* England —— The Church of *England* does not pretend to *appropriate* them to herſelf; but owns they belong to *other* Churches, as well as to *Her*. Beſides; —— *Belong ſo ſolely to* one, *that they cannot be appropriated*, i. e. *belong ſolely to* another, is very odd *Senſe*: If they belong *ſolely* to one, they cannot *at all* belong to another. If This Writer, as He is not very exact in his Language, by *appropriated* means *apply'd*; I abſolutely deny his Aſſertion, and let him prove it if he can. After the Words *Church of England*, the young Gentleman adds; † *nor by Conſequence to any other of the reform'd Churches, as be-*

* P. 77. † *Ibid.*

ing all upon the same Bottom. If the Marks of a true Church do not belong to the Church of *England*; it will indeed not only follow, but follow *a fortiori*, that they do not belong to any *other* Church, whether reform'd, or unreform'd. But, by his Leave, all the reform'd Churches are not quite upon the *same Bottom* with the Church of *England*; for a very material Reason: Which if our Author does *not* know, he is very *ignorant*; if he *does*, he is very *unjust*.

Were not Tautology as delightful to *Him*, as it is nauseous to Me; *i. e.* as much as possible: He would not here so formally, with *1st.* *2dly.* and *3dly.* have repeated * his Texts about *the Pillar of Truth*; Christ's being *always with* his Church; *the Gates of Hell*, &c. to prove That there is *true Faith* in the *true Church*: Which Nobody denies that I know of.

If, † says he, *the reform'd Church of* England *can effectually prove that she has on her Side the necessary, and essential Marks of* THAT *Apostolical Church which* CHRIST *established upon Earth, and to which he made the Promises of a* PERPETUAL *Assistance*; *I will then own her to be a Part of the true Church of Christ.* That is to say, if She (tho' She pretends to no such thing) can

* *Ibid* † P. 78.

prove

prove herſelf to be the *Whole*; He will *own* her to be a *Part*. Very indulgent indeed! But the Favour would have been ſo much the greater; if it had not been founded upon Nonſenſe, and Contradiction. He adds, * *But if, on the contrary, I make it appear manifeſtly that they belong entirely to the Church in Communion with the See of* Rome, *excluſively of all the reform'd Churches; then the Church of* England *muſt own that She is engag'd in a defenceleſs Cauſe.* I grant the Conſequence; but deny the Antecedent: And deſire the Reader carefully to obſerve how he proves it, here, or any where elſe. † *And can have no Title to the Promiſes, 'till ſhe returns to her old Mother Church; whereof ſhe was a Part for the ſpace of no leſs than nine hundred Years.* The Church of *Rome* is not *Mother* to the Church of *England*; There was a Church in *Britain*, as ſoon as at *Rome*, if not ſooner: And if They argue from the Converſion of the *Saxons*; The Church of *Rome* is no more the Mother of Ours upon That Account, than one Man becomes the Father or Maſter of another Man by converting him to Chriſtianity. Neither did the *Engliſh* Church upon That Account, become a *Part* of the *Romiſh*, as ſhall be

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

shewn in our Examination of the Fourth Dialogue: In which our Author discourses of This matter more at large.

We are to *form* a *Judgment*, He says, * 1st. *Whether the Conversion, or Reformation of* England, *was properly the Work of God. For He could not be the Author of Both.* Why so? Because, as He attempts to prove, the Religion to which *England* was converted was the same as Popery: Which I totally deny; and than which nothing, as it will appear, can be a more gross and notorious Falshood.† 2dly. *Whether the essential Marks of the true Church, to wit, her perpetual Visibility, her uninterrupted Succession of Bishops and Pastors in the same Communion from the Apostles down to This time, and her Catholicity, or Universality both of Time, and Place, are applicable to the Church of* England, *or to the Churches in Communion with the See of* Rome. These then are his *three essential Marks* of the *true Church*: Let the Reader carefully attend to them; For the whole Issue of the Cause, it seems, is to turn upon them. *Perpetual Visibility*, of one sort, or other, belongs to the Church in *general*; but neither to the Church of *Rome*, nor the Church of *England*, in *particular*. An *uninterrupted Succession of Bishops, and Pastors*

* P. 79. † *Ibid.*

from

from the Apoſtles down to this time, the Church of *England* has, as much as the Church of *Rome*. But what is the Meaning of Thoſe Words, *in the ſame Communion*? Cardinal *Bellarmine* ſpeaks out, and ſays the *fifth Note* of the Church is the *Succeſſion* of *Biſhops*, &c. in the *Church* of *Rome*. Which, tho' it be proving a thing by itſelf, the conſtant Way of *Popiſh* Arguing, is however ſpeaking ſo as to be plainly underſtood. But our Author has a more delicate, and moſt uſeful Fallacy in Thoſe Words, *the ſame Communion*; implying that the Church of *England* is not the *ſame Communion* ſhe was before the Reformation. And why ſo, I pray? Even becauſe She is not now *in Communion* with the Church of *Rome*; and has thrown off all Thoſe Doctrines, and Practices, which We call *Romiſh* Corruptions. The Sophiſtry of This (not to mention the odd Uſe of the Word *Communion*) I have elſewhere detected, by diſtinguiſhing between what is *eſſential*, and what is *accidental*, and obſerving that the *ſame Man* may be *ſick* at one time, and *ſound* at another. *Catholicity of Time* I take not to be Senſe: What he would ſay, if I rightly underſtand him, falls in with *Perpetuity*, and ſo ſhould not have been nam'd as *another* Mark. If *Catholicity of Place* means *poſſeſſing the whole World*; it is no *Mark* even of the Church in *general*, much leſs of any *particular*

cular one. If it means *being the Whole*, or including *all* the *Parts*; no doubt it belongs to the Church in *general*; that is to say, no doubt the Whole is the Whole: But for the same Reason, 'tis a *Contradiction* to apply it to *any* Church, or Churches in *particular*. But more of This in our Examination of the last Section of the last Dialogue; where our Author makes his Assumption, and enforces his whole Argument. At present I make the following Observations.

1*st*. Here again, as above, We must distinguish, tho' They do not, between Those material Particles *A*, and *The*. Doubtless, there ought to be, and actually are, *Marks*, or *Notes*, by which *a* Church, meaning *This*, or *That* particular Church, may be prov'd *a true* Church. But the Papists will needs find out such Marks as prove *Their* Church to be *The* Church; that is, either prove a *Part* to be the *Whole*, which *all* the Marks *in the World* will never be able to do: Or prove *Their* Church to be the *only true* one, which the *particular* Marks by Them assign'd will never be able to do; Nor indeed any other. 2*dly*. We grant that Theirs is *a true* Church in *one* Sense; meaning a *real* Church: And they do but vainly endeavour to prove that Ours is *not* so. But 3*dly*. The great Question is, or ought to be, what makes *a true* Church in the

the *other* Senſe, *i. e.* a *ſound*, and *good* one: And This Queſtion the Papiſts, for a very *plain Reaſon*, carefully avoid. *Truth*, *Soundneſs*, and *Purity* of *Faith*, and *Doctrine*, according to the *only true* Rule, *the Word of God*, are undoubted eſſential Properties, and abſolutely neceſſary Marks or Notes of *a true* Church in This ſignification: And Theſe are *Marks* which our Author takes no notice of. According to Theſe, Ours is in This Senſe *a true* Church, and Theirs *a falſe* one. *4thly.* The *Marks* or Notes of *a falſe* Church, Thus underſtood, *i. e.* an *unſound*, *corrupt* Church, are *plain*, and *obvious* to *every body* that can *read the Bible* with the *common Underſtanding* of a *rational Creature*; not ſuch *dark* and *blind* ones at beſt (for many of them are evidently *no* Marks at all) as the Papiſts lay down to diſtinguiſh *the true* Church; which require much more *Explanation* than the Thing they are pretended to *explain*. That Church is *certainly* and *manifeſtly* unſound, and corrupt, which *evidently* contradicts the Scriptures in ſome of the moſt material Points; impoſes Terms of Communion, a Complyance with which the Law of God forbids; teaches Doctrines which encourage all manner of Wickedneſs, and utterly evacuate the whole Deſign of the Goſpel. It may, notwithſtanding all This, be *a true* Church in the *other* Senſe; *i. e. really a* Church: But

But we may be *damn'd* for *communicating* with it, for all That. Nay, we certainly *ſhall* be ſo; unleſs *involuntary Ignorance* excuſe us, or (which we have not the leaſt Reaſon to hope for) *uncovenanted Mercy* be extended to us.

To the Third SECTION;

Of the firſt Entrance of Chriſtianity into Britain; *its Progreſs, and Eſtabliſhment there, in the Reign of King* Lucius.

A very few Words will be ſufficient to diſpatch This Section; becauſe it contains nothing but a Recital of Facts, which, whether true, or falſe, do not affect our preſent Controverſy. For what is it either to Us, or our *Romiſh* Adverſaries, that St. *Peter* went to *Rome* at ſuch a time; that *Claudius* came into *Britain*; that *Britain* was reduced into a *Roman* Province under *Domitian*; that *Lucius* was the Son of *Coilus* King of *Britain*, in the Reign of *Trajan*; that He ſent to Pope *Eleutherius*, who ſent *Damianus*, and *Fugatius*, &c. in ſhort, that at laſt *Britain* was converted to Chriſtianity? I know no Uſe our Author could make

make of This, and indeed the greateſt Part of what follows in This Dialogue; unleſs it were to *diſplay* his *great Reading*, or to *amuſe weak Minds* with the *Solemnity* and *Formality* of ſo much *Hiſtory*.

Here therefore, and wherever elſe I meet with the ſame Sort of Learning, I ſhall be very brief; only taking notice of ſome few Particulars which ſeem the moſt conſiderable.

* When he tells us that St. *Peter* went to *Rome* in the 2d Year of *Claudius*; he agrees indeed with *Baronius*, and *Bellarmine*, from whom he had it; but not with St. *Luke* in his *Acts of the Apoſtles*, from which the Contrary is demonſtrable. And in That Paſſage, —— † *According to* Euſebius, *who writes Thus of him*; Peter *the Apoſtle of the Country of* Galilee, *the firſt chief Biſhop of Chriſtians* —— *remain'd Biſhop of That City for* 25 *Years together*. Euſ. in Chron. An. Chriſti 44. He puts a falſe Quotation upon us; there being no ſuch Words as *firſt chief Biſhop of Chriſtians* ‖; nor *remain'd Biſhop* &c. in the Place referr'd to. Nor does *Euſebius* either there, or any where elſe, ſay that St. *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome* 25 Years;

---

* *P.* 80. † *Ibid.* ‖ Unleſs ὁ κορυφαῖος may be ſo render'd.

or

or that he was ever Biſhop of *Rome* at all. *

† He ſays, *King* Lucius *reſolv'd ſeriouſly, and promis'd, to embrace openly the Chriſtian Faith; tho' he did not judge it ſeaſonable till ſome Years after, to put this good Purpoſe effectually in Execution. There were two main Obſtacles,* (both of them from worldly Intereſt) *which tho' he was a Convert in his Heart, kept him back,* &c. That is, He continued a Heathen in outward Practice for ſome Years after he was a Chriſtian in his Heart. This, it ſeems, our Author does not blame in *Him*; but in his Third Dialogue, he is very ſevere upon *Cranmer* for a Prevarication of the ſame Nature. In him it was a heinous Crime, that in King *Henry's* Reign ‖ *He was a* Lutheran *in his Heart, ——and did not throw off the Mask, till the next Reign.* And the Biſhop of *Meaux*, as quoted in the Preface, ‡ is perfectly tranſported againſt him upon That Account. If *Cranmer* was guilty of Diſſimulation, ſo was *Lucius*: And thus the *chief Inſtruments* of *England's Converſion, and Reformation*, were upon an equal Foot in That reſpect. Why ſhould the ſame Thing be ſo ſtrong an Argument againſt the One, and none at

---

* See Dr. *Ave's* Life of St. *Peter*. Sect xi. throughout.
† P. 85. ‖ P. 175, 176. ‡ Pref. P. xiii, xiv. &c.

all

all againſt the Other? If our Author *inſiſts* upon This Topick, He *condemns* the *Converſion*; If he *gives it up*, he ſo far *acquits* the *Reformation*. It is in truth no Argument againſt Either: If it were; it would go much farther, than the *Romaniſts* would have it: For St. *Peter* himſelf, even while he was making Converts, was guilty of *Cowardiſe*, and *Diſſimulation*. *

Tho' with regard to the Point we are now conſidering, 'tis no Buſineſs of mine to reflect upon the Memory of Pope *Eleutherius*; The Church of *Rome* in his time being undoubtedly pure, whatever He was; yet I think he deſerves not the Title of *Saint*, which our Author beſtows upon him: † Unleſs *Saintſhip* be conſiſtent with *Montaniſm*. ‖ Which latter, by the way, is certainly inconſiſtent with *Infallibility*.

Speaking of our owing our *ſecond Converſion* to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, He concludes the Section in Theſe Words. ‡ *In recompence whereof, his holy See has ſince been diſtinguiſh'd here by the honourable Title of the Whore of* Babylon, *and his ſacred Perſon by that of Antichriſt*. The Church of *England* does not *call Names* in This manner; however ſome particular Perſons may:

---

* *Gal.* II. 12. 13. 14. † *P.* 86. ‖ See Dr. *Cave's* Life of *Irenæus*. *P.* 164. ‡ *P.* 88.

and

and even They, conſidering the Provocation given them, may well enough be excus'd. She inſiſts, if he pleaſes, that both the *See*, and the *Biſhop*, are *damnably corrupt*: And if This be true, as We have prov'd it is; where is the *Ingratitude*, or *Injuſtice* in ſaying ſo? We ſhould be guilty of neither; even if *We* were the *firſt converted*, and the *preſent* Pope, and Church of *Rome* our Converters: Becauſe it would be our *indiſpenſable Duty* to proteſt againſt, and avoid ſuch Corruptions. If a Man converts me to the true Faith, afterwards revolts from it Himſelf, and would perſwade me to do the like; does *Gratitude* oblige me to *follow* him, or even not to *declare againſt* him? How much ſtronger then is our Anſwer; when it is conſider'd how many Centuries have paſs'd ſince *England*'s Converſion; and that the Church of *Rome* conſiſts not *Now* of the *ſame Individuals* it did *Then?* This Author, and his Friends, when their Turn is ſerv'd by it, can coin a thouſand nice *Diſtinctions* without a *difference*. And on the other hand, when their Turn is ſerv'd by it too, *cannot diſtinguiſh* between the *Whole*, and a *Part*; between *Paſt*, and *Preſent*; between Perſons *now* living, and Perſons dead eleven hundred Years *ago*. *

* See backwards, P. 20.

To

To The Fourth SECTION:

Of the Converſion of the Engliſh Saxons *from* Paganiſm *to* Chriſtianity.

IN This, likewiſe, and the two following Sections, we meet with little to our Purpoſe. The Converſion of the *Saxons* by *Auſtin* the Monk under Pope *Gregory* I. at the End of the ſixth Century is well known to the World: And what Occaſion our Author had to give us ſuch a *formal Hiſtory* of it in This Place, I cannot imagine; unleſs it were for the two Reaſons I Before aſſign'd. P. 189. I therefore purſue the Method then propos'd.

Tho' it be no very material Circumſtance, *what* Pope it was, whom * *Gregory*, *when a private Prieſt*, ſolicited to *ſend ſome able Miniſters* to *Britain*; This Writer is perhaps too poſitive in ſaying it was *Benedict*: Becauſe I find another very good Author † telling us it was *Palagius* II.

---

* P. 85, † *Verſtegan.* Reſtitution, &c. P. 141.

He acquaints us * from *Bede*, that *Auſtin* and his Fellow-Miſſionaries, being upon their Journey for *England*, were *ſeiz'd with a ſlothful Fear*, and humbly deſir'd Pope *Gregory* that They might be permitted to drop their Deſign of converting the *Saxons*, and *return home*: *Auſtin* Himſelf being *ſent back* to make That Requeſt. Sure This *Cowardiſe*, and *Tergiverſation* of Theirs was almoſt as bad as *Cranmer's*: And the One almoſt as good an Argument againſt This *Second Converſion*; as the Other againſt the *Reformation*.

His Reflection † upon *pulling down the Croſs* in *Edward* VI's Time; with his ſaying, *that to the everlaſting Shame of Chriſtianity it was treated as an Image of ſome infamous Traytor, by the bleſſed Reformation*; is fraudulent, and ſland'rous. It was pull'd down only to prevent *Idolatry* in Worſhipping the Croſs, not as a Mark of *Ignominy* upon the Croſs itſelf: Which latter is always the Caſe, when the Statue of a *Traytor* is defac'd. The Image of the Croſs is ſtill *us'd* among us, tho' not *ador'd*: It ſtands upon our Churches; and our Foreheads are ſign'd with it in our Baptiſm.

---

* *P.* 90. † *P.* 93.

The

The following Paſſage is remarkable enough. * *For He* [King *Ethelbert*] *had learn'd from his Inſtructors, and Leaders to Salvation, that the Service of Chriſt ought to be voluntary, not by Compulſion.* So We Proteſtants ſay. And We add that Papiſts now adays have *not* learn'd the ſame Doctrine: Witneſs the *Inquiſition*; and their Laws about the *Burning* of *Hereticks*. We have Proof therefore, and 'tis confeſs'd, that Thoſe Inſtructors *then* taught *one* Doctrine at leaſt different from what the Church of *Rome* teaches *now*. So that the Religion of *Rome* was not exactly the ſame Then as it is Now; tho' our Author aſſures us it was: Of which hereafter. I very well know what was his Deſign in quoting Thoſe Words, and laying an Emphaſis upon them by printing them in a different Character; It was to reflect upon the *perſecuting Spirit* of *our* Church, and the *Force* us'd at the *Reformation*: Of which too in a more proper Place. To a more proper Place, likewiſe, we refer our Remarks upon what is contain'd in Thoſe Words of His, † *All the Biſhops of* Britain *were by Pope* Gregory *put under* St. Auguſtin's *Juriſdiction*; as alſo upon SAYING MASS, the Uſe of HOLY WATER, and RELICKS in *Auſtin's* Time: Which our

* *P.* 95. † *Ibid.*

Author, for ſome important Reaſon we muſt think, has taken Care to have printed in Capital Letters.

To The Fifth SECTION:

ENTITULED,

A Relation of St. Auguſtin's *Conference with the* Britiſh *Biſhops.*

IT is no wonder that This Gentleman is * ſo angry with the *Britiſh* Biſhops, and takes ſo much pains to blacken them: The Reaſon is plain; They were refractory, inſiſted upon their own Rights, and would not ſubmit to the Papal Juriſdiction; however he afterwards pretends to ſet another Face upon That matter.

Of the Conference † at *Auſtin's Oke*, as related both by *Cambden*, and *Bede*, I have nothing to ſay at preſent; farther than to obſerve, *1ſt.* That *Auſtin's* Miracle in opening the Eyes of the Blind, being intended to convince the *Britons*; it would have been leſs liable to ſuſpicion, had the Man, upon

---

* P. 97, 98, & Paſſim. † P. 99, 100, 101.

whom

whom the Miracle was to be wrought, been of the *Britiſh* Race, not of the *Engliſh*. 2*dly*. That the Story of the ſilly Advice given by the *Hermit* to the *Britiſh* Biſhops, concerning the Judgment they were to make of *Auſtin*, from his *riſing up*, or *not* riſing up, when they came to him, is in my Judgment a very ſtrange one, and ſcarce credible; tho' related by *Bede* himſelf. Not that it ſignifies any thing, either way. Of *the three Points* ſaid to be propos'd by *Auſtin* to the *Britons*, notice enough will be taken; when we come to the Examination of the *Ninth* Section.

To The Sixth SECTION:

ENTITULED,

St. Auguſtin *Vindicated.*

LET St. *Auſtin*, in God's name, be *vindicated* from any *unjuſt* Aſperſions, which have been caſt upon him: As *ſome*, no doubt, there have been; Tho' after all, much might be ſaid to prove him not ſo great a *Saint* as the Romaniſts make him. And ſince I have mention'd This; I cannot forbear adding, that the ſame may be with truth obſerv'd of the *great* St. *Gregory* himſelf

ſelf. To paſs over other Inſtances, his fulſom, and little leſs than blaſphemous Letter to That Miſcreant *Phocas*, when he had got Poſſeſſion of the Empire, his ſhameful *Ingratitude* in rejoycing over the Murder of his great Benefactor the Emperor *Mauritius*, and ſhamefully *flattering* his Murderer, will for ever be enough to ſhew that it is not altogether * ſo *impertinent*, as our Author ſuppoſes, *to accuſe That eminent Saint of Baſeneſs*. And moreover, that among the Qualifications for which he was ſo † *deſervedly ſurnam'd* the Great, *Holineſs* was not the moſt conſiderable. I juſt touch upon This Subject, not that I take Delight in making ſuch Reflections, tho' never ſo true; but to put our Adverſaries in mind that it is no great Wonder, if St. *Gregory*, and St. *Auſtin*, tho' they converted Part of our Iſland, yet made unjuſt Encroachments upon it; and if ſome few Corruptions crept into the Church even in Their Days. I ſay *ſome few*; For that *Their* Religion was not the ſame as the preſent *Popery*, we ſhall ſee in due time. Thoſe who have affirm'd that it was, have *indeed aſpers'd* them; As our Author, among others, has done. For done it *He* has, (tho' I confeſs with a quite different Deſign) as well as † *Holinſhead*, and ho-

* *P.* 100. † *P.* 88.

neſt

neſt *John Bale*, as he merrily expreſſes himſelf. In the main, we honour the Memory of both Thoſe eminent Perſons, St. *Gregory*, and St. *Auſtin*, as the Inſtruments of our Converſion; and bleſs God for the ineſtimable Benefits which by *Their* Means were convey'd to us.

The famous Controverſy about the * Hermit's *wiſe* Advice, together with the Character given of him; as alſo the Diſcuſſion of That important Queſtion concerning St. † *Auſtin's* Behaviour, whether he were *found ſitting*, or *ſtanding*; I wholly give up to our Author, to be by Him made the moſt of, and determin'd either way, as He ſhall think proper. I only obſerve, that conſidering how much Pains he takes, and how many Pages he ſpends, in clearing St. *Auſtin* from the Imputation of *Pride* laid to his Charge by the *Britiſh* Biſhops, He ſeems hard preſs'd in his Defence of him: And if *Auſtin* were a proud Man, he was certainly no great Saint.

How blameable ſoever the *Britons* might be, in not ‡ celebrating *Eaſter* according to the Determination of the firſt *Nicene* Council; That Fact at leaſt ſhews that they receiv'd their Cuſtoms from the *Eaſt*, not from *Rome*: And the ſame Argument may

* *P.* 103, 104. † *P.* 105, 106, 107. ‡ *P.* 105.

be drawn from their Diſagreeing with the *Romiſh* Church in the Adminiſtration of *Baptiſm.* From whence it appears that before St. *Auſtin*'s Coming, *Rome* had no *Dominion* over them. It may here too be very properly ask'd, ſince our Author ſo confidently appeals in This Caſe to the firſt *Nicene* Council; how it comes to paſs, that the Church of *Rome* ſlips over another Canon of the ſame Council? I mean the *Sixth*; the famous Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω. A Canon, which alone, if there were no other Argument, as there are a thouſand, would be enough to ſtrike the *Pope's Supremacy* dead forever.

St. *Auſtin's* * thinking himſelf *Metropolitan*, and *Primate*, over the *Britiſh* Prelates, ſhall be fully ſpoken to in our Examination of the Ninth Section.

Tho' we are not oblig'd to vindicate every thing written by *Holingſhead*, *Bale*, and *Fox*; not one of whom is by Us eſteem'd any great *Champion of the Reformation*: † yet our Author had little Reaſon to be ſo very gay, and witty, in triumphing over them.——‡ *John Bale, and his moſt faithful Dorothy.* ‖ *Have a little Patience; I have a Brace more of Proteſtant Hiſtorians, not at all inferior*, &c. *honeſt John Bale,*

* P. 107. † P. 109. ‡ *Ibid.* ‖ P. 118.

and

and his Nameſake John Fox. Let him have as many *Brace* of them, as he pleaſes; Let Thoſe he here mentions be never ſo *wrong* in *ſome* things, they were *right* in *reforming* from the Errors and Abominations of Popery. Whatever *Miſtakes* have been committed by *Fox* in his *Acts, and Monuments*; He has ſaid *Truth enough* in them to make the Church of *Rome* bluſh as red as the Blood ſhe has ſpilt: Were it in her Nature to be capable of *bluſhing* at *any thing.*

That *Fox* is ſo * *vile an Author*, as *This Author* repreſents him; That there are *modeſtly ſpeaking at leaſt ten thouſand notorious Lies either expreſly aſſerted, or inſinuated* by him; that *to call a Man one of* Fox's *Saints, is proverbially become the ſame as to call him a great Rogue*, unleſs it be among Papiſts; are themſelves ſo many ſcandalous and malicious Falſhoods: And That is as much *Anſwer*, as Theſe *unprov'd*, and *ungrounded* Aſſertions deſerve.

We have likewiſe his *bare Word* for it, and nothing elſe, that † *the Slaughter of the* 1200 *Monks* [at Bangor] *happen'd above a Year after St.* Auſtin's *Death*; *and was order'd by a Pagan King of the* Northumbers, *with whom St.* Auſtin *never had the*

* P. 110. † *Ibid.*

leaſt

leaſt Communication. The contrary Aſſertion is much better ſupported by the moſt learned Primate *Bramhall* (a Name that will for ever be the Terror of *Rome*) who in his *Juſt Vindication*, &c. P. 84. *Edit. Dublin.* writes Thus. *They refus'd indeed to their own coſt; Twelve hundred innocent Monks of* Bangor *afterwards loſt their Lives for it.* Rome *was ever builded in Blood. Howſoever theſe Words* (quamvis *Auguſtino* prius Mortuo) *have ſince been* forg'd, *and inſerted into venerable* Bede, *to palliate the matter, which are* wanting *in the* Saxon *Copy.* To which we may add the Teſtimony of *Geoffry* of *Monmouth*; * who agrees with the other as to the *Main* of the Fact: An Hiſtorian whom our Author afterwards † quotes, and That in the Words *immediately preceding* This Narration; without the leaſt Reflection upon his Ability, or Veracity.

The young Gentleman at the Concluſion need not have given himſelf the Trouble of ſo many Deductions to prove ‡ that Mr. *Collier, was convinc'd in his Heart that St.* Auſtin *and his Followers preach'd the true Faith in This Iſland.* He might have ſaid the ſame of Proteſtants in general, if he had pleas'd: We all acknowledge it as an undoubted Truth. And ſo I proceed.

---

* Book xi. Chap. 13. † P. 139. ‡ P. 114.

To

To The Seventh SECTION:

ENTITULED,

Roman Catholicks *profeſs to this Day the Faith which St.* Auguſtin *preach'd.*

WE acknowledge This too: But then They profeſs much *more* than That Faith, and what is in its Nature *inconſiſtent* with it. But we go on with our Author. That * *it is impoſſible the* ſame *Chriſtian Faith ſhould be* true *in one Age*, and falſe *in another*, I grant; and ſagely obſerv'd it was. But thoſe Words, † *The Faith and Religion profeſs'd at This time by the Engliſh Roman Catholicks, cannot but be the true one, if it be the ſame as was taught by St Auguſtin*, require ſome Animadverſion. If by *the ſame as was taught* be meant *what* was taught; I grant the Argument is ſo far concluſive, that their Religion is ſo far true as it agrees with what St. *Auſtin* taught in the Main. I add thoſe laſt Words, for a Reaſon which will appear immediately. But if it means *nothing*

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

but

but what was taught; I deny that in This Senſe the preſent Roman Catholicks profeſs the ſame Faith and Religion that was taught by St. *Auſtin*. That we may proceed the more clearly I here lay down three *Propoſitions*, as the Foundation of what I have to offer upon this Head; and to which *Reference* may be had, as occaſion ſhall require.

I. Were it true that the Religion which St *Auſtin* brought into *England* was *altogether the ſame* as That which Papiſts profeſs; yet we might very conſiſtently with Reaſon, and with ourſelves, retain ſo much of it as is pure and genuine, and reject ſo much of it as is falſe and ſpurious; tho' we were *taught Both* at the *ſame time*, and equally *adher'd* to *Both* for *nine hundred Years* and upwards. Suppoſe a Man gives me a quantity of Wheat and Tares mix'd together; and I, without knowing the difference between them, for a *long time* make uſe of Both promiſcuouſly; Am I therefore either *fooliſh*, or *wicked*, if upon better Information I keep the Wheat, and throw the Tares away? Even upon this Suppoſition we ſhould have been oblig'd to St. *Auſtin*, who from *Heathens* made us *Chriſtians*: But does it therefore follow that we are not at all oblig'd to Thoſe who from *bad* Chriſtians in Faith and Doctrine made us *good* ones?

II. *Some*

II. *Some* Corruptions of *Popery* were indeed creeping into the Church, when St. *Auſtin* came hither; tho' but *very few*. For This Reaſon I added the Words *in the Main*, above-mentioned. He himſelf might poſſibly teach ſomething erroneous, beſides the Papal Juriſdiction; tho' it does not appear that He did. For tho' *Gregory* who ſent him was *ſuperſtitious* enough, and aſſerted the Doctrine of *Purgatory*; yet the Church of *Rome* in general embrac'd not That, nor any other Doctrine which We now call *Popiſh*. And therefore

III. To affirm that the Religion of the *Romiſh* Church was *entirely the ſame* Then as it is Now, is a moſt *groſs*, and *ſhameful* Untruth: As will appear from what I ſhall diſcourſe, and even from our Author's own Account of This Matter.

If all the Roman Catholick * *Hiſtorians* affirm This; I am ſure many Roman Catholick *Writers* declare the Contrary. Thoſe do, for Inſtance, † who place *Tranſubſtantiation* ſome hundred Years lower than *Auſtin's* time; as all the World knows it ought to be plac'd. But what need I refer to particular Writers, or Perſons? Do not *all* the Papiſts acknowledge that *Communion in one*

---

* *Ibid.* † See them quoted by *Tillotſon* againſt Tranſubſtantiation. P. 306.

Kind

Kind was first established by the Council of *Constance*; and the *five Sacraments*, which We do not receive, first invented by *Peter Lombard*? As for Protestants; *Holingshead*, *Bale*, and *Fox*, have been spoken of already. But to say that * *all Protestant Witnesses agree in Substance that* Augustin *and his Fellow-Missioners brought Popery into England*, is an Assertion worthy of our Author's Modesty. He himself cannot but know, as all the World does, that the whole Body of the Church of *England*, and all Protestant Churches, insist upon it that there was scarce any thing of Popery for the first 600 Years: It was within the sixth Century that *Austin* came into This Island; How then can They acknowledge that He brought Popery into it? Popery, *in all its Parts*: For That is what This Writer all along means.

Here he resumes his beloved Argument from our Homily, declaring that before the Reformation *whole Christendom was drown'd in abominable Idolatry, and that for the space of* EIGHT HUNDRED YEARS, AND MORE. I shall repeat nothing of what I have already answer'd; but refer the Reader to P. 59. 60. *&c.* What he says *now* upon the Argument is in These Words. † *Which in true Protestant Language brings*

---

* P. 114, 115. † P. 115.

Popery

Popery not only in Great Britain, *but in whole Chriſtendom, up to the very Time of* England's *Converſion*. Suppoſing *Popery* and *Idolatry*, in *true Proteſtant Language*, to be all one; tho' it is a *Papiſt*, not a *Proteſtant*, that talks at That fooliſh rate, concerning which ſee P. *69*. This does not *bring it up to the very time of* England's *Converſion*, by 153 Years: Reckoning the Reformation in 1550; *England's* Converſion by *Auſtin's* Coming in *596*, as All agree it was; and meaning by 800 and *more*, juſt 801, as we very well may. Take it how you will; It does not *bring it up* to *England's* Converſion, by *about* 150 Years, as we uſually, and properly ſpeak. Yet This Account in the Homily, He *poſitively* aſſerts, *brings Popery up to the* VERY *Time* of *England's* Converſion. The very Time *exactly!* It only wants 150 Years: And That is ſo *inconſiderable*; that it may very well paſs for *Nothing*. The Subject we are upon is the State of a Nation, or Nations, with reſpect to Religion. In 150 Years, in half That Time, in half a quarter of That Time, the Conſtitutions of Nations both in Church, and State, may be, and actually have been, *utterly chang'd*: Old Empires may be ſubverted, and new ones erected; Whole Kingdoms from Heathen become Chriſtian, from Chriſtian Mahometan, or Heathen again. Yet ſuch a Tract of Years, in our Author's Chronology,

nology, while he is ſpeaking of Theſe Matters, goes for juſt Nothing. Did he imagine we could not *tell Twenty?* What an Opinion muſt That Man have of our Underſtandings; who could think of impoſing ſo clumſey a Faiſhood upon us?

His poſitive Aſſertion that * *the Belief of the* Maſs *was unqueſtionably a Term of Communion in the Time of* Gregory *the Great,* had need be well ſupported; eſpecially ſince it is back'd by theſe ſtrong Expreſſions: † *The Thing is* NOTORIOUSLY *known; and Mr.* Collier *cannot have the* CONFIDENCE *to deny it.* Yet he produces nothing to prove it, but the weakeſt Kind of Arguing, Arguing from a *Word.* It is related by *Bede,* that *Auſtin* and his Fellows SAID MASS. But was *Maſs the ſame Thing* Then as it is Now? For a full Anſwer to This powerful Argument, I refer to the Word *Miſſa* in *Littleton's* Dictionary. If uſing *That Word* be a Proof of a Man's being a *Papiſt*; I confeſs, not only St. *Gregory,* but St. *Auguſtin,* St. *Ambroſe,* and St. *Cyprian* were Papiſts: And did the Church of *England* retain it at This Day, I ſhould have no Quarrel with her for it: As I ſhould Now have none with the Church of *Rome,* were there Nothing to be objected

---

* *P.* 116. † *Ibid.*

againſt

againſt her, but That. In ſhort, *Maſs* ſignify'd *Divine Service*, eſpecially the *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper*: But not a Word or Thought, in Thoſe Days, of the *real Body and Blood of Chriſt* in it, of its being *a propitiatory, expiatory Sacrifice*, of the *Elevation*, and *Adoration* of the *Hoſt*. When therefore our Author accuſes Mr. *Collier* of Inſincerity and Unfair Dealing, for tranſlating *Bede's* Words, by *perform'd all the Offices of Religion* inſtead of by *ſaid Maſs*; He is extremely guilty of it himſelf. They may as well be render'd the former Way, as the latter; or rather much better, conſidering how the Word *Maſs* is *now* us'd. Not that the Argument would be of any Force, were the Tranſlation as He would have it; for the Reaſon I have now given.

* He affirms that the Uſe of *ſacred Veſſels, Ornaments for Altars, Veſtments for Prieſts, Reliques of the holy Apoſtles, and Martyrs*, as alſo *ſprinkling Churches with holy Water*, all practis'd in St. *Gregory's* Time, *is as plain Popery as ever was practis'd*. Indeed? Has the Church of *England* at preſent no *ſacred Veſſels, Ornaments for Altars*, or *Veſtments for Prieſts*? As for *Reliques*; an innocent and pious Uſe

---

* *P.* 116. 117.

was made of them at firſt: But it began to degenerate into Superſtition long before *Gregory's* Time; and *in* his Time, That Superſtition was come to a conſiderable Height: Concerning which I refer to the 1ſt and 2d Propoſitions. But of *Worſhip*, or *Adoration*, paid to them even in *his* Time, there is no Appearance; nor has This Author given us the leaſt Proof of any ſuch Thing.

The Uſe of *Water*, to *ſprinkle Churches* at their Conſecration, if there was any ſuch Thing, might be innocent even Then: It might be a pure *Ceremony*, for Decency and Solemnity; Or perhaps there might be ſome *Superſtition* mix'd with it: If there was; I refer to the firſt and ſecond Propoſitions, as before. Certain it is, there was no ſuch *Holy Water* in Thoſe Days, as there is in Ours: No ſuch *Vertue*, or *Efficacy*, aſcrib'd to *any Water* Then, as there is Now. Here again therefore our Author only *plays* with a *Word*; 'Tis Quibbling, not Arguing. It is further to be noted upon the Words *Maſs*, *Holy-Water*, &c. as us'd by *Bede*, that He wrote his Hiſtory 100 Years after *Gregory's*, and *Auſtin's* Time; when Superſtition had made greater Advances: And therefore it does not follow that he us'd ſuch Words in the ſame Senſe as They did, if ever They us'd them at all. *Calling* Churches by the *Names* of Saints, is not the ſame as *Conſecrating*, or *Dedicating* Churches *to* them: Nor is *placing Reliques*

liques in *Churches*, the ſame as *adoring* them. Which may ſerve as a full Anſwer to what our Author ſays * about Thoſe Matters. Of *Images* and *Pictures*, more at large preſently. † *Purgatory*, and a *Middle State of Souls*, are not all one; as He fallaciouſly ſuppoſes. However, We grant Pope *Gregory* believ'd a Purgatory; and inſiſt, as we well may, becauſe we have often prov'd it, that He was erroneous in ſuch his Belief. Prop. II. *And it is to be obſerv'd* (ſays He ‡) *that* Aerius, *and* Vigilantius, *were condemn'd by the Church as Hereticks, in the 4th Age, about* 200 *Years before St.* Gregory; *the one for oppoſing the Doctrine of Purgatory; and the other for holding that all Prayers made to Saints deceas'd were fruitleſs and vain, that no honour was to be paid to them, and that to give any reſpect to their Relicks was downright Idolatry. 'Tis therefore plain that theſe three Articles concerning Purgatory, invoking the Saints, and paying a religious Reſpect to their Reliques, were Terms of Communion in St.* Gregory's *Time; ſince the Tenets contrary to them had been condemn'd as Hereſies long before.* How were Thoſe Men condemn'd by the *Church* as *Hereticks?* Were they *condemn'd*, and declar'd *Hereticks* by any *Council?* One of

* P. 117. † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

them, *Aerius*, is * ſaid indeed to have taught Heretical, as well as Schiſmatical, Doctrines; but I never heard that his Denial of *Purgatory* was one of Them. He condemn'd *praying for the Dead*, I confeſs; and, by the way, I do not find that even This was deem'd *Hereſy*; tho' it was Contradicting one general Opinion and Practice of the Church: But *Prayers for the Dead* as *Then* us'd had no Relation to *Purgatory*. Of *Vigilantius's* Opinion we know nothing, but what St. *Jerom* has told us. † About *praying to Saints* he ſays not one Word: He ſays indeed, in Anſwer to *Vigilantius*, that the Saints pray *for us*; but This does not prove that We are to pray *to them*. And if our Author can prove that to condemn *ſuch Praying* was eſteem'd Hereſy by the Church about St. *Jerom's* time, or any Time before it; I will yield the Cauſe to him. The Truth of the Matter is; *Vigilantius* condemn'd ſuch *Honour* as was then generally paid to the Reliques, and Tombs, of the Martyrs. Upon which St. *Jerom*, in his vehement Way, falls upon him with as much Zeal, and Severity, as if he had deny'd the Reſurrection. Yet in all That Sharpneſs, and

* St. Auguſt. de Hæreſibus. Hær. 53. † Epiſt. ad Riparium; unà cum Tractatu proximè ſequenti adverſus Vigilantium. Tom. 2. P. 120. Edit. Froben.

Fervency

Fervency of Contradiction, which is apt to carry Men into the *other Extreme*, He is ſo far from favouring any *Worſhip*, or *Adoration* of Saints, or their Reliques; that He proteſts againſt it in the cleareſt, and ſtrongeſt Expreſſions. * We are are ſo far from "worſhipping, or adoring the Reliques of "the Martyrs; that we do not worſhip the "Sun, nor the Moon, nor Angels, nor "Archangels, *&c.* We *honour* the Reliques "of the Martyrs; that we may *adore* "Him, whoſe Martyrs they are." I know our Author will tell us, This is the very Reſpect *They* pay to Reliques; They only *honour* them, but do not *worſhip* them. And This ſhall be anſwer'd, when we come to *Images*, and *Pictures*. It may here be further obſerv'd, that St. *Jerom* in This Epiſtle takes notice of *Vigilantius*'s not being ſo much as *cenſur'd* by his *own Biſhop:* Much leſs was He then *condemn'd by the Church*, is an *Heretick*. From what has been ſaid it appears that Thoſe Words of our Author, *'Tis therefore plain that theſe three Articles*, &c. to the End of the Paſſage laſt cited, either

* Nos autem non dico Martyrum reliquias, ſed ne ſolem quidem, et lunam, non Angelos, non Archangelos ----- colimus, et adoramus. Honoramus autem reliquias Martyrum; ut eum, cujus ſunt Martyres, adoremus. *Hieron. adverſus Vigilant.* ubi ſupra.

proceeded from ſhameful Ignorance, or are ſhamefully fraudulent, and colluſive. *Purgatory* was not deny'd by *Aerius*; nor *Invoking the Saints*, nor *worſhipping Reliques*, or (if you pleaſe) Paying *ſuch* a *religious Reſpect* to them as the *preſent Papiſts* do, condemn'd by *Vigilantius*: Becauſe there were *no ſuch* Doctrines, and Practices, in *Their time*. Nor could our Author have urg'd a more unlucky Evidence than This of *Vigilantius*: Becauſe while St *Jerom* inveighs againſt Him, for decrying *ſuch* an *Honour* as was then paid to the *dead Bodies*, and *Tombs*, of the Martyrs; He declares that the Church in his Time did not *worſhip* them: And ſo This Inſtance turns directly *againſt* the Popiſh Cauſe. Farther; According to our Author's own Account, *Vigilantius* maintain'd that *no* Honour, *no* Reſpect, ſhould be paid to Saints, and their Reliques: And from the Church's condemning *This* Doctrine as Heretical [tho' it never did ſo] infers that Paying a *religious* Reſpect was a Term of Communion, *&c.* Is there *no* Reſpect, but *religious* Reſpect? What a Conſequence is This?

In the next Page * two Inſtances are given, as quoted from *Baronius* by Mr. *Collier*, of *our* Departure from the Religion

* *P.* 118.

which

which *Auſtin* introduced: The one is, our aboliſhing the *Monaſtick Life*; for *Auſtin* was a *Monk*, and now We have *no Monks*: The Other is our not making the ſame Uſe of the *Croſs*, and of our *Saviour's Picture*, as was made in *his* Time. Suppoſing Both were true; I hope *Monkery* is not *eſſential* to *Chriſtianity*, or *Churchſhip*: And if *Auſtin*, and his Followers, made an *Idolatrous* or even *Superſtitious* Uſe of the *Croſs*, and our *Saviour's Picture*; we are not bound to do ſo. But 2dly. Our Author ſays nothing to Mr. *Collier's* Obſervation that the Church of *England* has not declar'd againſt the *Monaſtick Life* in any of her Articles. To his Obſervation, * *that the Diſſolution of Abbies here was an Act of the State, not of the Church; that it was prior to the Reformation*, &c. He anſwers, *that it was more properly an Act of the Church than of the State. Becauſe Viſiting, Reforming, and Diſſolving Religious Houſes, is moſt certainly an Exerciſe of Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction.* What if it be? Cannot Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction be *uſurp'd*? But beſides; It is *not* an Act of Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction *ſtrictly* ſo call'd: Of which we ſhall have Occaſion to ſay a great deal, when the *Third Dialogue* comes under Conſideration. Then likewiſe will of

* *Ibid.*

Course be answer'd what He here adds in the next Words; * *Besides that the Dissolution of them was commanded by K.* Henry *not as temporal Sovereign in his Dominions, but as supreme Head of the Church,* &c. At present I only observe, 1st. That whatever he did of This Kind, He did by *Act of Parliament*; which I think belongs to the *State*, not to the *Church*. 2dly. Supposing all This had been done by the *Church*; still 'twas a *Popish* Church: Popish in all Respects, except That of acknowledging the *Pope's Supremacy*. Our Author's saying that † *This Exception spoils all*, is extremely Trifling. *For no Man* (adds He) *was ever acknowledged to be a* MEMBER *of the* CHURCH *of* Rome, *who deny'd the Pope's Supremacy*. Well, be it so: We do not say They were *Members* of the Church of *Rome*; but They profess'd the *Religion* of the Church of *Rome* in all *other* Respects. They were not *Protestants* therefore: They were Papists in every Instance, but one; and not only so, but zealous for That *Religion*. ‡ *Neither* (says He) *was the Dissolution of Abbies* wholly *prior to the Reformation, as Mr.* Collier *is pleas'd to tell us: Unless he means that it was prior to the Reformation in the Reign of* Edward VI. *and Queen* Elizabeth.

---

* *P.* 119. † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

So

So he might very well mean; and You yourſelf in effect own he might. P. 251, 252. Of which hereafter, in the *Third Dialogue*. There alſo, in Anſwer to what the Biſhop of *Meaux* diſcourſes, ſhall be conſider'd what our Author Here lays down, as a Poſition of undoubted Truth; That *diſcarding the Pope*, and veſting the *ſpiritual Supremacy* in the *Crown*, was not only a *Part*, but the very *capital Branch*, of the *Reformation*.

His whole Diſcourſe about the *Croſs*, *Images*, and the *Picture of Chriſt*, is Nothing but a Repetition of the well known Popiſh *Shuffling* upon the Words *Honour*, *Reſpect*, *Worſhip*, *Idolatry*, &c. * *I am glad* (ſays the Young Gentleman) —— *that the Church of* England *has a great Regard to the Croſs, and Picture of our Saviour.*—— *However the Nakedneſs of Proteſtant Churches ſeems to ſpeak another Language. For I have ſeen indeed the Pictures of* Moſes, *and* Aaron *in ſome of them; but never found a* Crucifix, or *Picture of our Saviour in any.* So have I found Both: They are Both to be ſeen in ſome Proteſtant Churches; if the Picture of our Saviour upon the Croſs may be call'd a *Crucifix*. Not that it would be any great Reflection upon us, if all he ſays were true:

* P. 120.

and

and if ſome of our Churches were in This reſpect *more naked* than They are. He *takes it for granted*, that the innumerable Images, Pictures, Crucifixes, and other *Religious Furniture*, with which Popiſh Churches are crouded, tend very much to the Honour of God and Chriſtianity: But That is a Point, which it would become them rather to *prove*, than to *ſuppoſe*. * No better ſupported is the Preceptor's Aſſertion, *That it was the Practice of Chriſtians above* 1400 *Years ago to bleſs themſelves, upon all occaſions, with the Sign of the Croſs*. Nor does the Paſſage ſo often cited from *Tertullian*, *de Corona*, C. 3. in the leaſt prove it. From thence indeed it appears that they *us'd* the Sign of the Croſs very much; even upon the moſt common Occaſions of Life: But they us'd it as a Badge or Token of their Profeſſion, as a Mark of Diſtinction, to ſhew that they *glory'd in the Croſs*, while they liv'd *among Heathens* who *deſpis'd* it; Not a Word about *bleſſing themſelves* with it, or their placing ſo much *Vertue*, and *Efficacy* in it, as Papiſts do at preſent.

But now for the *Worſhip* of the *Croſs*, our Saviour's *Picture*, and other *Images*: To which I add *Reliques*; the *Evaſions* of our Adverſaries being the ſame as to *all* of

* *Ibid.*

them,

them. *If* (* ſays the Preceptor) *he means to inſinuate that We pay Idolatrous Worſhip to Images, and Pictures; He wrongs us moſt grievouſly, and I fear his own Conſcience into the Bargain. For a Man of his Learning cannot be ignorant, what our true, and real Doctrine is, in reference to the Matter before us.* He might be a Man of the greateſt Learning in the World, and yet be ignorant of This: For they *Themſelves* are ſo; and could never yet agree in any one Meaning about it. Our Author, to be ſure, underſtands his *own* Meaning; and other particular Perſons underſtand Theirs: But what is This to the Doctrine of the *Generality?* If This Gentleman, and Others, be not for *Worſhipping*, but only *Honouring*; many of their greateſt Men have declar'd themſelves on the contrary Side. *Thomas Aquinas* determines poſitively, that the *ſame Reverence* is to be paid to the *Image* of Chriſt as to *Chriſt* himſelf; and that the Image is to be ador'd with *Latria*; which, according to their own Account, is the higheſt Sort of Worſhipping; and greater cannot be paid to God. The ſame he ſays of the *Croſs*, in the very next Article. To omit

* *P.* 121. † Sequitur quod eadem reverentia exhibeatur imagini Chriſti et ipſi Chriſto. Cum ergo Chriſtus adoretur adoratione latriæ, conſequens eſt quod ejus imago ſit adoratione latriæ adoranda. 3. Q. 25. Artic 3.

Bona-

Bonaventure, Capreolus, Castro, Canisius, Turrianus, and many more (* *Vasquez* reckons thirty, and adds himself to the Number) the great *Bellarmine* † will have Images worshipped not only upon Account of the Prototype, or Thing signify'd, but for *their own Sakes*; so that the Worship may be *terminated* in the *Image*. Nay, the *Cross itself* is *invok'd*, and *pray'd to* in the Passion-Hymn. *Thomas Aquinas* makes This a *Medium* to prove that the Worship of *Latria* is due to it. ‡ He argues. " To That in which " we place the Hope of our Salvation We " pay the Worship of *Latria*: But We place " the Hope of our Salvation in the Cross; " For Thus the Church sings; *O Cross,* " *our only Hope, hail, in This Time of the* " *Passion, increase the righteousness of the* " *Just, and give Pardon to the Accus'd, or* " *Guilty*. Therefore the Cross is to be a- " dor'd with *Latria*. " An admirable Argument! And I shall not go about to disprove it. I only ask, does not the Church *sing the same Song* still? I never heard she had *left*

* See Turretin. Institut. Vol. 2. P. 59. Nay He (*Vasquez*) insists upon it that *any* inanimate Thing whatsoever may be ador'd with *Latria*. † Lib. de Imag. Chap. 21. apud eund. Turret. ‡ Illi exhibemus latriæ cultum in quo ponimus spem salutis; sed in cruce Christi ponimus spem salutis: Cantat enim Ecclesia; O Crux ave, spes unica, hoc passionis tempore, auge piis justitiam, reisque dona veniam. Ergo crux Christi est adoranda adoratione latriæ. 3 Q. 25. Art. 4.

it

it off: Or if ſhe will ſay ſhe *has*; We have as good an Anſwer to give her upon That Suppoſition, as upon the Other. To which we may add, that to prepare the Way for This precious Hymn, the Prieſt, uncovering the Croſs, ſays; * *Behold the Wood of the Croſs*: The Quire anſwers; *Come, let us adore.* This is the *Good-Friday* Hymn. And leſt we ſhould imagine that by the Croſs is metonymically meant Chriſt crucify'd upon it; Care is taken to prevent That Conſtruction: For the One is expreſly *diſtinguiſh'd* from the Other. † *Thou only wert worthy to bear the Purchaſe of the World*: i. e. Chriſt.

Not but that take it *how you will*, the *Practice* we are conſidering is totally and abſolutely *forbidden*. Call it *Worſhip*, *Honour*, *Reſpect*, what you pleaſe; nay, declare in the moſt ſolemn manner that it is not *Worſhip*, but *Reſpect*; ſtill it is a *Religious* Reſpect: Our Author himſelf ſeveral times ſtiles it ſo. And all *Religious* Reſpects, directed *to*, or *towards*, Images, are utterly unlawful. We are forbidden to *bow down to*, or *before*, them. || Do not *Papiſts* bow down *to*, or *before*, them? We are forbidden to *ſerve* them: ſo even *Dulia* is cut

---

* *Ecce lignum Crucis.* Chor. *Venite, adoremus.* Turret. ubi ſupra † Sola digna fuiſti ferre pretium ſeculi. Ibid. || For *to* them, and *before* them, ſignify the ſame. See Exod. 20. 5 compar'd with 2 Chron. 25. 14. In the original Hebrew it is more plain.

off.

off. We are forbidden even to *make* them, or have them; *i. e.* for any *Religious* Purpoſe. They will ſay, This is not *Idolatry:* Admit it; For tho' I am far from granting it, I will not cavil about That Word neither: All this while 'tis *forbidden;* 'Tis a *Sin*, whether you call it *Idolatry*, or not. Tho' We muſt here remember that we could juſtly lay the Charge much heavier, than according to This ſofter Senſe; and That too not only againſt *particular* Perſons, as above, but againſt the *Church* of *Rome* her ſelf. For beſides her *publick Devotions* juſt now cited, to which might be added a Multitude more, containing rank *Idolatry*, and *Blaſphemy*, if there be ſuch Things in Nature; our Author, as well he may, refers us, for her true Senſe, to Pope *Pius*'s Creed, and the Council of *Trent*. That Council refers us to the 2d Council of *Nice*, * which injoins *Adoration* of *Images*, in the ſtrongeſt Terms; and *anathematizes* Thoſe who ſo much as *doubt* concerning it. And when Some deſir'd that the Word *Adore*, which ſeem'd too harſh, might be changed for *Venerate*, which ſounded ſofter; the Council pronounced Them *Hypocrites* who would profeſs to *venerate* Images, yet not *adore* them; and declared them guilty of *reviling the Saints*. Now

* See Turret. P. 58.

the

the Council of *Trent* appealing to This of *Nice*, and explaining its own Meaning by it, manifeſtly declares, and enacts the very ſame Thing. Or to return, and put it upon the other Suppoſition, the *lower*, and *ſofter* Senſe; If the *Religious Reſpect*, as our Author calls it, which even He, and Thoſe of his Opinion, pay to *Images*, be not *Worſhipping them*, there is no ſuch Thing as *Worſhipping them at all*; (for Nobody was ever ſottiſh enough to worſhip any *Image* as *God*) And This makes Nonſenſe of the ſecond Commandment; and That is Blaſphemy. The Main of what has been now ſaid about *Images* may be apply'd to *Reliques*. They *bow*, and *kneel* down to them; They *kiſs* them in a *religious* way; They *pray before* them; Nay, they *ſwear by* them; which is *flat Idolatry*. Or if they reply, it is not; Let them for Argument's ſake, as Before about Images, enjoy their Saying: It is *unlawful*, and a *damnable Sin*, whatever *Name* it is call'd by.

At *beſt*; their moſt *learned* Men are *divided* in their Opinions concerning the *Senſe* of this *Religious Reſpect*. What ſhall the *Ignorant*, and *Illiterate* do? 'Tis plain They give all the *outward* Signs of *Adoration* to theſe *Things*, that they can give to *God* himſelf. Can they, when they *outwardly* do what God has forbidden, be ſecur'd from *inward* Idolatry, or ſome

Sin

Sin of That Kind; by vertue of thoſe *Refinements*, *Niceties*, and *Diſtinctions*, which they never *heard of*; or, if they did, can no more *underſtand*, than they do the Coptic Language; and concerning which their *profoundeſt Doctors* are not *agreed*?

I think I have taken effectual Care to bring This Matter to a *plain Iſſue*; avoiding That Peſt of *Arguing*, and almoſt of Common Senſe, *Wrangling about Words*. If, when we ſee theſe Men *kneel*, *bow*, *kiſs*, and the like, They will tell us we are *miſtaken*, and that it is *not properly*, Kneeling, Bowing, and Kiſſing; then, I confeſs, a *new*, and *noble* Scene of *Controverſy* is open'd: And 'twill be time enough to diſcuſs it, when it comes before us. In the mean while; let them call This Bowing, Kneeling, and Kiſſing, in a *religious* way too, (for ſo they *all agree* it is) let them call it, I ſay, by the Name of Worſhip, Adoration, Veneration, Honour, Cult, Reſpect, or whatever elſe they pleaſe: Still it is *contrary* to the *expreſs Commands* of God, and *his Vengeance* is denounc'd upon Thoſe who break them.

But, as Papiſts manage the Diſpute, the Queſtion is not, whether *They worſhip Images*; but whether there *can be* any *Image-Worſhip* at all: Or, if there be, whether there be any *Crime* in it, or no. Another Inſtance of their great *Honour* and *Reſpect* for the holy *Scriptures*! The ſame may be ſaid

ſaid of their Diſtinctions (for they are in effect the ſame) about the Worſhip of Saints, and Angels. According to which Method of Proceeding, *i. e.* interpreting the plaineſt Words contrary to their plaineſt Meaning, one may diſtinguiſh away all the Ten Commandments, all the Precepts of the old, and new Teſtament, all the Laws of God, and Man.

And as it is thus ſtated (ſays He) *It has been a Term of Communion ever ſince the* Manichees *began to ſhew themſelves profeſs'd Enemies of holy Pictures; that is, ſome Ages before St.* Gregory's *time.* This is to teach us two Things. 1ſt. That to deny Image-Worſhip is a Part of the *Manichæan* Hereſy. 2dly. That Image-Worſhip obtain'd in the Church ſome Ages before St. *Gregory's* Time. Both which are groſs and moſt impudent Falſhoods. I add, the firſt of them is a moſt *impious*, as well as impudent one. Good God! That to oppoſe a Practice which the divine Law forbids in the plaineſt Words that can be deviſ'd, ſhould by any *Chriſtian* be call'd a Part of the moſt filthy, deteſtable, diabolical Complication of Hereſies that ever appear'd in the World! What if *the* Manichees *were Enemies to ſuch Pictures* as he calls *holy*? The Devil himſelf may ſpeak *ſome* Truth. The *Jews*, we grant, are at this Day averſe from *Image-Worſhip*; but we will ne-

ver grant that therefore it is *Judaiſm* to be ſo. *They acknowledge* the Old Teſtament, muſt *We* therefore *deny* it? This Author ſurely will not ſay that every thing is *Proteſtantiſm* which *Proteſtants* hold; any more than We ſay that every thing is *Popery* which *Papiſts* hold. But I am aſham'd of having ſaid ſo much about Nothing. Nothing, I mean, in Point of Reaſon; For in Point of Fact, a more *wicked*, and *profane Calumny* was never invented. I ask our Author, after all, where He met with this Piece of *Hiſtory*, that the *Manichees*, in *any* Age, were *profeſs'd Enemies to holy Pictures*, as He calls them. And if He ſays I wrong him, becauſe he does *not affirm* that 'tis *Manichæiſm* to oppoſe them; I ask 1ſt. Whether he does not affirm that the *Manichees* were profeſs'd Enemies to them? 2dly. Whether he does not conſider the *Manichees* as *Manichees*; or reckon This as one of THEIR *Errors?* And 3dly. whether every *Error* of the *Manichees*, as *ſuch*, be not *Manichæiſm?* If to the ſecond Queſtion he anſwers, No; I ask once more, to what purpoſe all This was brought in, unleſs it were *ad conflandam Invidiam*, and to *inſinuate* at leaſt the ungodly Scandal aforeſaid?

He proceeds. * *I dare therefore confidently aſſure Mr.* Collier, *that he may with the*

* P. 121, 122.

ſame

ſame ſafety of Conſcience carry his Reſpects for Thoſe pious Objects [Images] *to the Lengths of the Church of* Rome, *as he* kiſſes the Bible, *or* bows *to* the Communion-Table, *or to the* venerable Name of *Jeſus*: *Or finally, as he* keeps holy Days *in Honour of* Saints *departed.* I anſwer; Neither the *Bible*, nor the *Communion-Table*, nor the *Name of Jeſus*, nor a *Holy-Day*, is an *Image*: Bowing to Images is *forbidden* in Scripture; and was ever by *all Mankind*, in *all Ages*, deem'd *worſhipping* them, or paying *religious Honour* to them. *Bowing* to the *Communion-Table* is *not* forbidden; nor can it in the common Language, and Senſe of Mankind, be call'd *worſhipping* it: Tho', by the Way, we do not ſo properly bow to the *Communion-Table*, as *towards* the *Eaſt*; which is founded upon an antient Cuſtom, univerſally practis'd in the primitive Church: Not that 'tis enjoin'd by *our* Church; Or if it were, 'tis a *Ceremony*, and nothing elſe. Bowing *to*, or rather *at*, the *Name* of *Jeſus* is not only not forbidden, but in effect commanded. *Kiſſing the Bible* is only the *Form* of *taking an Oath*, and a *mere Ceremony*. By keeping *holy days* of *Saints*, We pay no *religious* Honour to the *Perſons* of Thoſe Saints, but only a *grateful* one to their *Memories*: And that we *worſhip* the *Days* themſelves, I hope Nobody will affirm; Our religious Ho-

nour upon Those Days, as well as others, is paid to God only. * *All which* (continues He) *are undoubtedly religious Respects, as being paid upon a religious Motive, and ultimately referr'd to God himself.* If by *religious Respects* he means *Circumstances* having *some relation* to Religion, as every *Ceremony* in Divine Worship has; I grant it: If he means *religious Honours* to any *Being* but *God*, as by the Word *paid* he seems to do; I deny it, for the Reasons just mention'd. Those Words *ultimately referr'd to God himself*, are fallacious and delusive, and manifestly design'd to insinuate an Untruth in Fact, *viz.* That they are by Us *at all* referred, as Religious Honours, to *any other* Being. † *And of This nature*, He adds, *was the Religious Devotion which St.* Austin, *and his Company paid to the Cross, and Picture of our Saviour; when it was carry'd as a Banner before them.* I answer; there is no Hint that they paid it *any* religious Devotion *at all.* They did not *bow* to it, or *prostrate* themselves before it, as Papists do now. But of This more in what follows. ‖ *'Tis very true indeed, there is not the least Intimation in* Bede *that they worshipped it. And God forbid there should be any such Intimation; if by*

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‖ *Ibid.*

the

the Word Worſhip (*the* AMBIGUOUS *ſignification whereof is of wonderful uſe to* PROTESTANTS *in This Controverſy*) be meant *paying divine Honours to it: This indeed is not intimated by* Bede. This I have abundantly anſwer'd already; and ſhewn that the *ambiguous ſignification* of the Word *Worſhip* is of ſingular Uſe to *Papiſts*, not *Proteſtants*. But That Parentheſis is another Specimen of our Author's Modeſty. Who proceeds Thus. * *But the Relation of the very Fact before us, is more than a bare Intimation that they paid a* Religious Devotion *to it: This being wholly inſeparable from their carrying it in a* religious Proceſſion, *as a* Banner *before them.* 1ſt. I obſerve that our Author is for paying not only *religious Reſpect* to the Croſs, Pictures, and Images, but *religious Devotion*: For *Devotion* is ſomething more than *Reſpect*. 2dly. Why muſt their *walking up* to King *Ethelbert* in a *ſolemn manner*, with the *Croſs* before them, be call'd a *religious Proceſſion*, as That Phraſe is now us'd? He may as well ſay that, among *Us* Proteſtants, a Dean and Chapter of a Cathedral, walking with the *Virge* carry'd before them, make a *religious Proceſſion*. For 3dly. If carrying the *Croſs* as a *Banner* gave it the Nature of a *Religious* Proceſſion; then *Con-*

* *Ibid.*

Stantine the Great, whenever He *march'd* his *Army*, after He became a Christian, made a *religious Procession* likewise. But He enforces his Argument. * *For I presume Mr.* Collier *will not deny that when in our solemn Processions abroad, we have the Cross, and the Reliques, and Pictures of Saints carry'd before us, we intend to pay a religious Honour to 'em by so doing. And so did without all Dispute St.* Austin *and his Company; who by their own Example introduced That Form of Devotion into This Island.* I grant the First, and deny the Second. Papists certainly pay *religious Honour* to those Things; and would therefore own they *worship* them, were not the *ambiguous Signification* of That *Word* of great Use to them. This I not only grant, but have above insisted upon, to shew the vile *Shuffling* of This Writer in playing with the *ambiguous Signification* of Words, and by vertue of That sometimes *affirming*, and sometimes *denying* the very *same thing*; according as his *Turn* is best *serv'd* by *either*. But that St. *Austin* and his Company paid such Honour to the Cross and Picture, we have not the least Evidence; unless it be our Author's *without all Dispute*, and so forth.

---

* *Ibid.*

* *But*

* *But ſuppoſe they had proſtrated themſelves before the Croſs, or Picture of Chriſt, or bow'd down to it, and kiſs'd it, as we do*, &c. It ſeems then They *did not* : Which, if we conſider what has been diſcours'd, is ſomewhat *material*. The Remainder of the Paragraph is a Repetition of his Quirks about the *Bible*, and the *Communion-Table*; with the Addition of ſomething concerning our *Sacramental Bread, and Wine* : † To which we do not pay any *religious Honour*, or *Reſpect*, by *kneeling down before* them; As he very well knows, or may know if he pleaſes; Our Church having ſufficiently *declar'd herſelf* upon That Subject.

Pope *Gregory* I. was ſo far from ſending *Image-Worſhip* into *England*, that he expreſly condemns it, in his two Letters to *Serenus*, Biſhop of *Marſeilles*. For notwithſtanding the *ſhameful Evaſions* of our Author, the plain Fact was This. Images and Pictures having ſome time before been introduc'd into Churches, the People of *Marſeilles* began to *worſhip* them, I mean, to *kneel*, *bow*, and *proſtrate* themſelves, before them. Upon which, the good Biſhop pull'd them down, and broke them to pieces. *Gregory* commends his Zeal for hindering the *Worſhip* of them; but diſapproves of his

* *Ibid.* † P. 123.

breaking them; because he thought they might in some measure supply the Want of *Books* to the poor People who could not *read.* His Disapprobation even Thus far is in very gentle Terms: * But as for the *Adoration* of them, he frequently declares against it in the strongest Expressions. To This what says our Author?

† P. *Sir, Pope* Gregory *writes nothing in That Letter but what every Roman Catholick in the World will subscribe to.* That is, They will *double*, and *prevaricate*, and *quibble* upon the Words *Worship*, *Honour*, and *Respect* as Before; and interpret Pope *Gregory*, as They do the *Scriptures.* ‖ *The People at* Marseilles *had effectually carry'd their Devotion to the Pictures hung up in their Churches even to* a criminal Excess, *as St.* Gregory *calls it. Which, by the by, is* AT LEAST AN UNANSWERABLE PROOF, *that holy Images and Pictures were not only kept in Churches; but a religious Honour was paid to them long before that Time. For People do not usually come to* EXCESSES *all on a sudden; but pass gradually, and by Steps, from the moderate Use of Things to an Abuse of them, when that happens to be*

* *Sed frangere easdem imagines non debuisse judicamus.* ——Tua igitur fraternitas et illas servare, et ab earum adoratu populum prohibere, debuit. Lib. VII. Epist. 109. † *Ibid.* ‖ *Ibid.*

the

the Caſe. Would not one think now, by This formal Argumentation, that *Gregory* really *ſays*, what he is here *repreſented* to ſay? A *criminal Exceſs*, as St. *Gregory* calls it! *People do not uſually come to Exceſſes*——Whereas there is not one Word in *Gregory*, about *criminal Exceſs*, or any thing like it. He ſuppoſes *Proſtration* to imply *Adoration*, and the Adoration of a Picture to be a Sin: * Abſolutely forbids *all ſorts* of Worſhip to Images, and Pictures; † all Sorts of *Creature-Worſhip* whatſoever: and quotes Luke IV. 8. for That purpoſe. ‡ In another Quotation, ‖ Thoſe Words "*And our Worſhip at the ſame time be all* "*of it* REFER'D *to God, and* DIRECTED *to* "*the Holy Trinity*," are wrong tranſlated. *Gregory* ſays, ‡ *and that they may proſtrate themſelves in adoring the holy omnipotent Trinity only.* Everybody knows the Uſe which Papiſts make of the Word *referr'd* upon the Subject of Image-Worſhip: The Diſtinction of *direct* and *indirect*, *ultimate*

---

* In adoratione proſternantur. Lib. ix. Epiſt. 9. Et populus in adorare Picturæ minime peccaret. Lib. vii. Ep. 109. † Adorare vero imagines omnibus modis devita. Ibid. Frangi vero non debuit, quod *non ad adorandum*, ſed ad inſtruendas *ſolummodo* Mentes neſcientium fuit collocatum. Ibid. ‡ Quia omne Manufactum adorare non liceat; quoniam ſcriptum eſt, *Dominum tuum Deum adorabis, et illi ſoli ſervies.* Ibid. ‖ P. 124. ‡ Et in adoratione ſoli ſus omnipotentis Sanctæ Trinitatis humiliter proſternantur. Lib. ix. Epiſt. 9.

and

and *subordinate*, turns upon it. Whereas St. *Gregory* says positively that the Trinity *only* is to be *ador'd*; not a Syllable about *reference*, or any such thing. In the same Passage, the Translation has it; *Take care that nothing made by them* [Statuaries, and Painters] *may be* HONOUR'D to ADORATION. As if They might be *honour'd* short of *Adoration*; meaning by the Latter such *Adoration*, as is due only to *God*: For so our Author explains himself. But in the Original the Words are, as I have above cited them; *Avoid the Adoration of Images* BY ALL MEANS, OR WAYS. And I hope those Words, which I have above cited too in the Original Language, *Plac'd in Churches not for Adoration*, but ONLY *for Instruction*, are utterly exclusive of ALL *Adoration*, *Honour*, *Respect*, or what You please; of all *Sorts*, and *Degrees*, of *Religious Regard* whatsoever; in short, of *every thing*, but *Instruction* only. Our Author therefore might have been asham'd to reproach Mr. *Collier*, and Others, for *applying* what *Gregory* says of the People of *Marseilles* to the present Church of *Rome*. *I heartily pray God* (* says He) *to forgive Him, and his Brethren, the Injustice they continually do us in their Misrepresentations of our Doctrine.*

* *P.* 124.

What?

What? Are we to have the old Story over again, about *A Papiſt miſrepreſented, and repreſented?* * Or do we want a new Monſieur de *Meaux*, to oblige us with another *Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church?* † Such an Account has been long ſince given of That matter; as to ſhew, to the everlaſting Infamy of Theſe Men, that no Perſons upon Earth can be more *guilty* of *Miſrepreſentation*, than Papiſts when they *complain* of *being miſrepreſented*.

To give the Reader a *thorough* Notion of their *Sincerity* and *Modeſty* upon This Article; I will produce a remarkable Paſſage from the Learned *Anſwerer* of their *Nubes Teſtium*; to whom I have elſewhere refer'd. If the *Romaniſts* do not *worſhip Creatures*, as they *declare* they do *not*, tho' we *ſee* they *do*; one would "‖ *wonder at the Index Ex-* "*purgatorius of the preſent Church of* "*Rome*, ‡ which commands *Solus Deus* "*Adorandus* (*God only is to be ador'd*) to "be ſtruck out of the *Marginal Notes* of *Humfredus*'s *Latin Tranſlation* and *Edition*

* See ſeveral Pamphlets with that Title, and the ſeveral Anſwers to them, in the Years 1685, and 1686.

† See a Pamplet ſo call'd? and an excellent Anſwer to it, entituled, *An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of England* &c. with ſeveral Vindications of it. *London* Printed for *Richard Chiſwell* 1686,---87.--88. ‖ *P.* 83, *&c.* ‡ *Index Libror. Prohibit: & Expurgandorum, p.* 234. *Edit.* Madrit 1667.

of

" of St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*'s *Comment* " upon *Esaias*; * and out of the *Marginal Notes* in *Robert Stephens*'s *Bible* printed 1557. *Serviendum Soli Deo*; † (*that we must serve God only*:) whereas *both these Passages* are the *very Words* of our " *Saviour himself*, Matthew 4. 10. I would " fain know of *any Romanist*, how *this* is " not *virtually* and in *effect* to command " that *that Verse* in the *Gospel* should be " *struck out*; though *it* contains *our Saviour's own expressions*, who should surely " be allowed to understand his *own Religion* " as well as the *Managers of the Index Expurgatorius*.

" And for what relates to the *Cross it self*, they have ‡ ordered that *non ut Adoremus* (*not that we should adore it*) " should be struck out of *Masius* his *Learned Commentary* upon *Joshua* 22. 28. *These* " are *things* so very notorious; that *my wonder* increases, and *my admiration* at *those* " *People*, who (notwithstanding all *this*) " would fain have *us* believe, that *they* " do not *worship the Cross it self*: When " not only *their PONTIFICAL*, and " *their SERVICE* on *Good-friday*, *teach* " and *shew* that *they* of the *Church* of *Rome*

---

* Cyrillus *ex Vers.* Humfredi Basil. 1566. *p.* 258. † *Index Expurg. p.* 99. ‡ *Index Expurg. p.* 47. *col.* 2.

" *adore*

" *adore the Croſs*; but *their Index Expur-*
" *gatorius* is ſo careful to ſtrike out of the
" *Indexes* to the *Fathers Works* any *thing*
" that doth but appear to *thwart* or *contra-*
" *dict* ſuch *worſhip*.

" If the *Church* of *Rome* doth not *wor-*
" *ſhip Images*; why is *ſhe* ſo careful to ſtrike
" out * of the *Index* to St. *Hierome* ſuch
" *innocent paſſages* as *theſe*, *Adorare Statuas*
" *vel Imagines*, *Cultores Dei non debent*;
" *the Worſhippers of God ought not to*
" *ADORE Statues* or *Images*; *Imago*
" *una tantum veneranda*, *One only I-*
" *mage*, [to wit, *God the Son*, the *expreſs*
" *Image* of *his Father*] *is to be worſhipped*?
" Why doth the *poor Index* ſuffer here, and
" not St. *Hierome* in *whom* † *theſe very*
" *Expreſſions are*?

" If the *Church* of *Rome* give *no Adora-*
" *tion* to *Saints* or *Angels*; why doth *her*
" *Index Expurgatorius* command *ſuch Paſ-*
" *ſages* as *theſe following* to be ſtruck out
" of ‡ the *Index* to St. *Athanaſius*'s *Works*?
" *Adorari ſolius Dei eſt*, *nullius autem cre-*
" *aturæ*; *Adoration is to be paid to God*
" *alone*, and *to no Creature with him*; *An-*
" *geli non ſunt Adorandi*, *Angels are not*

---

* *Index Expurg. p.* 311. † *Nos autem unum habemus virum*, *& UNAM veneramur Imaginem*, *quæ eſt inviſibilis & omnipotentis Dei. D.* Hier. *in* Ezek. *l.* 4. *c.* 16. ‡ *Index Expurg. p.* 52.

" *to*

" *to be adored; Creatura nulla adoranda,*
" *nulla invocanda, immo eam adorare Ari-*
" *anorum & Ethnicorum sit; No Creature*
" *is to* be *adored or invocated, to adore*
" *which would be to play the Arian*
" *or the Pagan.* I would fain know why
" the *Index* to *his Works* must be dealt *so*
" *severely with*, while *Athanasius himself*
" is *guilty* (if there be *any Crime in them*)
" of *every Expression* in the *passages* which
" are condemn'd by the *Index Expurgato-*
" *rius.*

" Let any one look into St. *Anathasius*'s
" *third Oration* against the *Arians*, and
" *He* may there find *this Great Father*
" (*upon occasion of his mentioning St.* John's
" *offer to worship the Angel*) speaking out
" * *plainly* enough, *that God alone is to be*
" *adored*, and *that the Angels* (since they
" are but *Creatures*) *notwithstanding their*
" *Excellencies are in the number of Wor-*
" *shippers, not of the worshipped.* In *his*
" *Epistle to Bishop* Adelphius *He* himself
" says, (what the *Index* to *him* did but
" transcribe,) *That we do not adore any*
" *Creature*; *God forbid* (says the *Good Fa-*

---

* Οὐκοῦν ΘΕΟΥ δεῖ ΜΟΝΟΥ τὸ Προσκυνεῖσθαι· καὶ πᾶσι ἴσασι καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ Ἄγγελοι ὅτι καὶ ἀλλήλοις δοῦλοι ὑπερέχουσιν, ἀλλὰ κτίσματα πάντα εἰσὶ καὶ ἐκ εἰσὶ δεῖ προσκυνεμένων, ἀλλα δεῖ προσκυνεῖν τὸν τῶν ὅλων δεσπότην. D. Athanas. *Orat.* 3. *contra* Arian: *p.* 204. *Edit.* Commel. 1600.

" *ther*

" *ther* *) *that we ſhould*, ſince *this would* " *be the ſame ſin that the Arians and Pa-* " *gans are guilty of*; *but we do adore the* " *Lord of the Creation, the incarnate Word* " *of God.*

" If the *Church* of *Rome* doth not *adore* " *the Martyrs* and *their Reliques*, why doth " *her Index Expurgatorius* ſtrike out of the " *Index* to St. *Hierome*, *Non adorantur* " *Martyres*, *Martyrs are not to be adored*; " *Adoramus Solum Deum*, *honoramus Re-* " *liquias Martyrum*; *We adore God alone*, " *and honour* only *the Reliques of the* " *Martyrs?* The *Managers* of the *Index* " *Expurgatorius* ought to have conſider'd, " that if there be *any crime* in *theſe Paſ-* " *ſages*, St. *Hierome* himſelf ought to an- " ſwer for *them*; ſince it was *He* that ſaid, " *Chriſtians did not adore the Martyrs*, † " much leſs their *Reliques.*

" Either the *preſent Writers* of the *Church* " of *Rome* are *not ſerious* and *in earneſt* " with *us*, or *they* think our eyes ſhut, and " that *we* do not ſee *ſome* of *their Books*: " It is very vain to talk (as our *Compiler* " doth) of *reſpect* only and *honour* to Saints

---

* —— Οὐ κτίσμα προσκυνῶμεν, μὴ γένοιτο, ἐθνικὸν γὰρ τῶν Ἀρειανῶν ἡ ταυτὸν πάθος, ἀλλὰ τὸν Κύριον τῆς κτίσεως σαρκωθέντα τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον προσκυνοῦμεν D. Athan. *Ep. ad* Adelph. *p.* 331.

† *Quis enim, O inſanum caput, aliquando Martyras adoravit, quis hominem putavit Deum? &c.* D. Hier. *c.* Vigilan. *T.* 2. *p.* 122.

and

" and their *Reliques* and *Images*, when " *we* see that *any thing* which offers to de- " ny *Adoration to all these is* condemned " by their *Authentick earthly Purgatory*, " the *Roman Index*.

" I will insist no farther on these *scanda-* " *lous things*, but hope I may, under the " *Protection* and after the *Example* of " *Gregory the Great*, conclude, not only " against *Images*, (as † *He* did,) but against " *every Creature animate* or *inanimate*, " *that NO RELIGIOUS WOR-* " *SHIP is or can be due or given to any* " *of them, because of that saying of our* " *blessed Saviour: Thou shalt WORSHIP* " *THE LORD THY GOD, and* " *HIM ONLY shalt thou SERVE.*

To This give me Leave to add another Quotation from a very great Man. *Answer to a Papist misrepresented &c.* P. 11. and 16. " To perform these Acts [Kneeling, " Burning Incense *&c.*] before Images with- " out a Design to worship them, is decla- " red by Great Divines of the Church of " *Rome* to be next to Heresy. *Suarez* " says this Way of *Durandus* (who was " against directly worshipping them) is dan- " gerous, rash, and favours of Heresy. " He adds, that his own Opinion, that Ima-

---

* Greg. M. *Ep.* 9. *l.* 9.

" ges

" ges were truly and properly to be wor-
" ſhipped, was generally receiv'd by their
" Divines. And therefore I need name no
" more.——Dares he deny Veneration to
" Images; when the Council of *Trent* ſays,
" *eisque Venerationem impertiendam? Bel-*
" *larmine* has a Chapter on purpoſe to
" prove that *true and proper worſhip* is to
" be given to Images. And was He a Miſ-
" repreſenter?"

Let every *Chriſtian*, as he tenders his eternal Salvation, *abhor* the *Principles*, and *Practices*, and *avoid* the *Tenets of theſe wicked Men*; who will contradict One another, Themſelves, the plaineſt Facts, Reaſon, Scripture, our Senſes; affirm, or deny, *ſay*, or *do*, *any thing*, to *deceive Souls*, and *increaſe* their *own Faction*; who, while they are labouring That Point, proceed upon a Maxim directly counter to thoſe Words of the Apoſtle, *Let God be true, and every Man a Liar*: On the contrary, ſay Theſe in Effect, let all Mankind beſides, let Reaſon, and our Senſes, and God himſelf, be Liars; ſo the Church of *Rome* be but *believed* to *ſpeak Truth*, while ſhe is telling the moſt *Monſtrous* and *Impudent Lies* in Nature.

The *Pope's Supremacy* is the next Point. And here our Author comes with That empty Diſtinction † between the *Church* of *Rome*

† *Ibid.* and *P.* 125.

and the *Court* of *Rome*; declaring himſelf Zealous for the One, but not deſirous of having any thing to do with the Other: That is, he declares for *French* Popery; which we all know the *Engliſh* Papiſts generally profeſs. But notwithſtanding this Diſtinction, I do not ſee how a Man can be a *Clergyman* at leaſt of the *Church* of *Rome*, without declaring for the *Court* of *Rome* in the ſtrongeſt Terms imaginable; if Aſſerting the Fullneſs of the *Pope's Power*, and *Juriſdiction*, may be ſo accounted. For does not every Eccleſiaſtic, even in *France*, ſwear to the Creed of Pope *Pius* IV? Of which Creed This is one Article: * "I do acknow-
" ledge the holy Catholick and Apoſtolick
" Roman Church, to be the Mother and
" Miſtreſs of all Churches; and I do promiſe
" and ſwear true Obedience to the Biſhop
" of *Rome*, the Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, the
" Prince of the Apoſtles, and Vicar of Je-
" ſus Chriſt." And this is part of That Faith, which is afterwards declared *neceſſary to Salvation* †. Nay, I do not ſee how a Man can be ſo much as a *Member* of the Romiſh *Church* without aſſenting to this Doctrine. For beſides that the Eccleſiaſtics ſwear to teach it, and preach it to all un-

* Art 23. † Hanc veram Catholicam Fidem, extra quam nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt.

der

der their Care; "To make a Man a Mem-
"ber of That Church (ſays a † learned
"Writer) he muſt declare that he holds the
"ſame Faith which the Church of *Rome*
"holds: And this is as much the Faith of
"the Roman *Church*, as the Pope and the
"Council of *Trent* can make it. And it
"is now printed in the *Roman Ritual* at
"*Paris*, ſet forth by *Paul* the 5th as the
"Confeſſion of Faith own'd by the Church
"of *Rome*." I am ſenſible the *Gallican* Clergy ſtrenuouſly oppoſe this Doctrine; but if they are *inconſiſtent* with themſelves, We cannot help That.

* His *limiting* the *Pope*, and giving him *ſo much* Power, as he *thinks fit*, both here, and in other Parts of his Book, ‡ is purely *Arbitrary*; and ſo is his declaring that ‖ *Infallibility* [of the Pope] *and the Depoſing Power neither are now, nor ever were, Terms of Communion.* If *He* is for a *limited Supremacy*; The Council of *Trent* is Not; *Bellarmine* is Not; the *Generality* of Romaniſts are *Not*. So it was juſt now about *Image-Worſhip*: *He* takes it in This, or That Senſe; but the *main Body* of Papiſts, and the Church of *Rome*, as a *Church*, take it otherwiſe. What Authority has *He* to im-

† Anſwer to Papiſt miſrepreſented, &c. p. 7.
* P. 125. ‡ P 127. 141. ‖ P. 125.

pose *his own Popery* upon us? Nay, why are we bound to take Popery as *France* gives it us; when the *Popery* of *Spain*, *Portugal*, *Italy*, and *Germany*, is different? *Had any Pope* (says he) ‡ *ever declar'd himself so as to regard all other Bishops as his Deputies, and Vicars; — he had reckoned without his Host.* And he denys ‖ *that the Pope has an Authority to send over a foreign Archbishop with a Commission to exercise ordinary Jurisdiction over* another *Archbishop.* But did he never hear of those *innumerable Writers*, *many Popes*, and *various Councils*, which have given the Pope an *absolute*, *unlimited* Monarchy; making the *Bishops*, as well as others, his *absolute Subjects* and *Vassals*, which is something more than his *Deputies*, and *Vicars*? But now the Pope's *Supremacy*, it seems, is become as difficult a Point as the *Infallibilty*; the *Reformation* having puzzled the Cause, and made it *more* difficult than it was before, tho' it was *never* fully agreed upon. I would only ask our Author, what He himself means by the *Pope's Supremacy*; or *how much* Supremacy he is pleased *to allow* him. In one place * he calls it *Superintendency*: But how are we the wiser *for That*? *Or what* does This *Superintendency* imply? He only tells

‡ *P.* 127. ‖ P. 141. * P. 127.

us

us of *ſome Power* which he does *not* yield to him; but what Power he *does* yield to him, he no where informs us. However, would his *French* Doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy have paſs'd *before* the Council of *Trent*? Or *at* it? Or is it Now generally receiv'd in Popiſh Countrys?

If the *Pope's Infallibility* was never a *Term of Communion*; it is at leaſt aſſerted, and Zealouſly contended for, by *great Men* of the Romiſh Church. But is our Author very ſure that the *Depoſing Doctrine* neither *is*, nor ever *was*, a *Term of Communion*? How then comes it to paſs, that Thoſe are *excommunicated* who *deny* it? As they are by the Bull in *Cæna Domini*. For in That, under more Articles than one, the Pope exerciſes an abſolute Authority over temporal Princes in their own Dominions: And if He be thus *King of Kings*, He has certainly a Right to *depoſe* them, for their Diſobedience.

His Aſſertion, That * *St.* Gregory *maintain'd the divine Right of his Supremacy over the whole Church as vigorouſly as any Pope ever did*, is juſt as true as the reſt. I grant ſeveral Popes had made their Encroachments, and graſp'd at more Power than was their due, before his time; particularly *Leo* I. at the Council of *Chalcedon*: Where,

* Ibid.

by the Bye, it was decreed that the Bishop of *Constantinople* should enjoy the same Privileges as the Bishop of *Rome*. Nor is there any doubt but *Gregory* himself had Ambition enough; which appears, to omit other Proofs, from That Instance relating to *ourselves*, which has been before hinted at, and will hereafter be considered more at large, his assuming an Authority over the *British* Bishops. See Prop. II. But as for *Supremacy* over the *whole Church*, and by *divine Right* too; it was not *come to That* in *his* Days. And how does our Author prove it was? * 1st. From *Gregory*'s saying (Lib. 11. Epist. 56.) *If it is pretended that the Bishop has neither a Metropolitan nor Patriarch; I answer that his Cause is to be heard and decided by the See Apostolick*; WHICH IS THE HEAD OF ALL CHURCHES. But may not *Sedes Apostolica* as well signify *any other* See Apostolick as That of *Rome?* For were there not *more* Apostolical Sees than *One?* What thinks our Author of *Antioch* particularly; of which St. *Peter* himself was Bishop? And then why may not the Words *all Churches* be restrain'd to all Churches in *That District?* He proves it, 2dly. From Lib. 9. Epist. 59. written, as He says, to the Bishop of *Syracuse*. *As to what they write of the Church of* Constantinople, *who doubts but that it is subject to the See Apostolick?*

I have look'd into two Editions, (whether our Author's *Edit. vet.* be one of them, I know not) and cannot find this Paſſage; nor is *Epiſt.* 59. Lib. 9. written to the Biſhop of *Syracuſe*. But we will take it for granted that the Words are *Gregory*'s. If *Conſtantinople* was ſubject to *any* Apoſtolick See, one would think it ſhoud be rather *Antioch* than *Rome*; becauſe *Conſtantinople* belong'd to the *Eaſtern* Church, and Empire, not to the *Weſtern*; being, as *Antioch* was, when the Empire was divided by *Conſtantine*, under the *Præfectus-Prætorio* of the *Eaſt*, not as *Rome* was, under That of *Italy*. Then here is nothing of *divine Right* ſo much as hinted at, in either of our Author's Proofs; yet That is *Part* of what he undertook to prove. And if he objects that I ſtrain *Gregory*'s Words, and put an arbitrary Interpretation upon them; I Anſwer, 1ſt. Let any indifferent Perſon judge, whether, conſider'd alone, or by themſelves, they do not bear *my* Senſe, at leaſt as well as *his*; if not better. 2dly If they are conſider'd in Conjunction with what *Gregory* elſewhere ſays; they *cannot* bear *his* Senſe, unleſs we will make That *eminent Saint* contradict himſelf. For declaring againſt the Title of *Oecumenical Biſhop* aſſum'd by *John* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, he at the ſame time, and in the ſtrongeſt Expreſſions, declares againſt *any* ſuch Power, in *any Perſon* whatſoever, as the Popes have ſince arrogated to themſelves.

This he does in several Letters to the Emperor *Mauritius*, *Eulogius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, *John* the Patriarch of *Constantinople* Himself, and Others.

But this our Author tells us * is a *threadbare Argument*; a *hundred times repeated*, and as *often* answer'd. 'Tis as easy for him to say the same of *all* our Arguments; and as easy for Us to say the same of all Theirs. But to the Point. † *As that Saint understood it*, he says, *the Title was unjustifiable on several Accounts. First, because it seem'd to import Jurisdiction over the whole Church.* Very well: Pray let it be remember'd, that, according to our Author's Concession, *Gregory* oppos'd it under That Notion. ‡ *Which* [Jurisdiction over the whole Church] *did not belong to the Bishop of* Constantinople, *nor was indeed challeng'd by him.* According to *Gregory*, it did not belong to the Bishop of *Constantinople*, nor to *any body else*: For he *absolutely condemns* the Title which it is acknowledged he took to imply Jurisdiction over the whole Church; *as such* pronouncing it *superstitious*, *profane*, *blasphemous*, *diabolical*, and the *Fore-runner of Antichrist*. It is indeed probable enough that it was not challeng'd by the Bishop of *Constantinople* in That Sense; but 'tis plain *Gregory* oppos'd it in That Sense; and our

* *P.* 126. † *P.* 127. ‡ Ibid.

Author

Author owns he did: Which, together with his oppoſing it abſolutely, or as apply'd to any Perſon whatſoever, is the very thing we aſſert, and all we want in this Argument. * *And 2dly.* (continues He) *becauſe it ſeemed to import that he was the only Biſhop in the World; or at leaſt that all other Biſhops were but his Deputies, and Vicars.* I anſwer, 1ſt. Admitting This; 'Tis no more Power than Popes have aſſum'd, and the Jeſuits and others allow them. 2dly. 'Tis evident that *Gregory*, in the place cited by our Author, did not uſe the Word *only* in an *abſolute*, but *comparative* Signification. Becauſe he explains himſelf, in very many Paſſages, to mean no more than a *Paramount Authority*, or *Preheminence*, uſurp'd over all other Biſhops. He ſays, for Inſtance, the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* imitated the Devil; who would have exalted himſelf above the other Angels, *ad culmen Singularitatis*, to the Height of *Singularity*. Did the Devil think *That* would have made Him the *only Angel*, and the *other* Angels *no* Angels at all, but only his *Vicars*, or *Deputies*? It would have made *Him* Monarch, if you pleaſe, and *Them* his Subjects; which is the Caſe of the Pope's Pretenſions, as to other Biſhops. But as our Author follows *Bellarmine* in this Piece of Chicane; for a full and parti-

* Ibid.

cular

cular Anſwer to it, I refer the Reader to the moſt learned Dr. *Forbes* * of *Scotland*: who in eight *Anti-Theſes*, as He calls them, has largely expos'd the Sophiſtry of That Cardinal upon this Argument. † *You would wonder* (ſays he) *at the Defence which our Adverſaries here make for themſelves.* He might well ſay ſo; for 'tis ſhameful Shufling indeed.

Obſerve then, with how much Truth our Author aſſerts that ‡ *no Pope in any Age ever took upon him the Title of Univerſal Biſhop, in the Senſe that it was inveigh'd againſt, and rejected by St.* Gregory. No? Not as *importing a Juriſdiction over the whole Church?* For in That Senſe he owns *Gregory* inveigh'd againſt it; and He inveigh'd againſt it, as I ſaid, *abſolutely*, or as apply'd to *any* Perſon. Let our Author's Conceſſion therefore, and That Pope's *general* Invective be put together; and ſee what will be the Iſſue. Indeed, had *Gregory* intended to have apply'd this Title to himſelf in this Senſe, as well as to have deny'd it to every body elſe; it is not to be conceiv'd but that He would have *ſaid* ſo. In ſhort; does the Pope aſſume a *Juriſdiction over the whole Church*; or *not*? If he does *not*; Where is his *Suprema-*

---

* Forbeſii à Corſe Inſtruct. Hiſtor-Theolog. P. 784, &c. ad finem.

† Mireris qua hic defenſione ſe Adverſarii tueantur

‡ P. 127.

cy? or in what does it conſiſt? If he *does*, as all the World knows he does; He aſſumes a Power and Authority which St. *Gregory* condemn'd. To which I add that *Gregory* is ſo far from applying this Title to himſelf; that he expreſly diſclaims it. * *None of the* Roman *Biſhops* (ſays he) *did ever aſſume That Name of Singularity.*

Let it be obſerv'd too, with what *Modeſty* our Author affirms that the *Belief* of the Pope's † *Supremacy over the whole Church was a* TERM OF COMMUNION *in Pope* Gregory's *Time, as well as now.* Suppoſing there were then ſuch a Thing pretended to, as I have ſhewn there was Not; how does it appear that the Belief of it was a *Term of Communion?* Why, our Author *poſitively aſſerts* it was: We have no other Proof; nor was there ever a groſſer *Falſhood* utter'd by Man.

‡ *And ſo* he will *always inſiſt upon it as an unconteſtable Truth, that Roman-Catholicks profeſs to this Day the Faith which St.* Auguſtin *preach'd.* This Aſſertion, I hope, I have fully conſider'd. ‖ *Becauſe it is impoſſible to prove from any Authentick Hiſtory that there happen'd any Change,* &c.

---

* Ad Maurit. Epiſt. 32. Nullus Romanorum Pontificum unquam hoc *Singularitatis* vocabulum aſſumſit. *As to himſelf he ſpeaks more plainly*, ad Eulog. Epiſt. 30. L. 7. † P. 125. ‡ P. 128. ‖ *Ibid.*

This

This fine Argumentation ſhall not fail to have Juſtice done it in our Examination of the next Section; in which it is unfolded at large. * *In all which ſpace of time* [*from* England's *Converſion to the Reformation*] *our Anceſtors, ſays a Proteſtant Writer, were all Papiſts with a Vengeance; Unleſs ſometimes a few Lollards ſtarted up,* &c. Why does not he name his Proteſtant Writer? And ſhew us that he truly repreſents his Meaning? Or if *a* Proteſtant Writer *did* ſay this; he ſaid what was falſe: Which is an Anſwer at leaſt as good as the Argument.

To the Eighth SECTION:

ENTITULED,

The ſame Faith *was preach'd to the* Saxons, *as had been preach'd four hundred Years before to the* Britons.

ALmoſt the ſame, undoubtedly; tho' perhaps not quite. But we will admit that it was altogether the ſame: And

---

* Ibid.

our

our Author's ſetting himſelf ſo *formally* to *prove* it, is the moſt *ſolemn* Piece of *Impertinence* we have had yet. Could he but ſhew that *preſent Popery* is the ſame Religion as *Auſtin* taught, without tracing it any higher; he would, as to Antiquity, do his Buſineſs effectually. He might therefore have ſpar'd his Pains in ſhewing that there was no Change in the Religion of *Rome* between *Eleutherius*'s and *Gregory*'s time. He knows we grant there was none; at leaſt none conſiderable: Tho' he has taken a ſtrange Way to prove even This; and his Arguments are utterly trifling, and inconcluſive. What occaſion had he to *miſplace* the *good old Sophiſtry*, ſo uſeful to Papiſts, and ſo much us'd by them, about *Changes* in *Religion*, and our being oblig'd to ſhew *when*, and *how*, and *by whom* they were made? Why does he transfer it from it's proper Periods to a Time in which no body pretends there were *any* ſuch Changes? He himſelf places it right in the foregoing Section *. *It is impoſſible* (ſays he) *to prove from any Authentick Hiſtory that there happened any Change in the publick Faith of the* Engliſh *Church, from it's Converſion under the* Saxon *Kings, till the pretended Reformation.* This is to the Purpoſe; tho

* *Ibid.*

there's

there's no Truth in it. But to take it as a Thing demonstrated, by Arguments which I have shewn to be groundless and absurd, that *present Popery* and the Religion of *Rome* in *Austin*'s time are all one, than which nothing can be more notoriously false; and, upon this Supposition, to go so gravely to Work, proving that there were *no Innovations* between *Eleutherius*'s time and *Gregory*'s, (which Nobody denys) and consequently that *Popery*, as it now is, was the Religion of the second Century; is, if possible, more *pompously ridiculous* than any thing we have hitherto met with. The Reader shall have a Taste of it. Taking it for *prov'd* (how well it is so, we have seen) that * *Gregory* was a *Massing Pope*, and that all the other *Popish Articles* mention'd in the foregoing Section were current in his Time, He proceeds Thus. *If therefore all these were Innovations brought in betwixt the Second and Sixth Century; if there was no Mass said at* Rome *in the Days of* Eleutherius; *If that Pope was not acknowledg'd Supreme Head of the Church; If in his time there was no Invocation of Saints, no Honour paid to their Reliques, no praying for the Dead* &c. *I must make bold to demand a particular Account taken from good Records, and Authentick History*, &c. And

* P. 131

so

ſo goes on with the Argumentation which I ſhall preſently examine, tho' as it will be more *properly apply'd*. Here I only ask our Author; will He then *really* and with a *ſerious Face* affirm, that there were ſuch things as *Maſs* in the Senſe of the preſent Church of *Rome*, as the *Pope's Supremacy*, Invocation of Saints, ſuch an Honour paid to their Reliques as is now paid, and praying for the Dead with a View to Purgatory, in any Part of the Second Century? If he will; I appeal to all knowing and unprejudic'd Perſons, even among the Romaniſts themſelves, whether there ever was a greater Inſtance of Ignorance, or Inſincerity.

A Church, he grants, may change it's Religion; * *but then*, ſays He, *it muſt be proved from unqueſtionable Hiſtorical Facts, that* Rome *chang'd its Faith in the Interval of Time, between the Converſion of the* Britons *and that of the* Saxons. For the Reaſons juſt now given, inſtead of the laſt Clauſe read, *between the Converſion of the* Saxons *and the Reformation*: And I anſwer, 1ſt. We *can* give an Hiſtorical Account of ſome *Romiſh* Corruptions. For Example, and to paſs by ſeveral other Particulars *Image-Worſhip* was eſtabliſh'd by the ſecond Council of *Nice*, at the latter end of the

* *P.* 129.

8th.

8th Century, under *Irene*; as it was condemn'd about seven Years after, by the Council of *Frankford*, under *Charles* the Great. Several Popes particularly *Leo* the First, had made some Encroachments upon the Church; but *Universal Supremacy* was first pretended to by *Boniface* III. at the Beginning of the 7th. Century. The Number of *seven Sacraments* was first started by *Peter Lombard* in the 12th Century, and establish'd by the Council of *Trent* about 150 Years ago. *Transubstantiation*, and the *Half-Communion*, are own'd to be *New* by Papists themselves. But 2dly. and chiefly, We cannot indeed give an Historical Account of the *Rise*, and *Growth*, of *many* Popish Corruptions; But then it is not in the least *incumbent* upon us to do so, nor has the Church of *Rome* any manner of Right to demand it. That they are in Being we *know*, because we *see* them: That they really *are* Corruptions, We prove from their Repugnancy to the plainest Scripture, to primitive Antiquity, to Natural Religion, and Common Honesty, to Themselves, to Reason, and our Senses. And should I see a Man covered over with *Leprosy*, or eaten up with the *King's Evil*; would not his *Arguments* and his *Modesty* be very singular, should he discourse Thus? If you *pretend* that I have the Leprosy, or the King's Evil

Evil; * *to make good this bold Aſſertion, you muſt produce plain, and undeniable Facts to prove that there was a Change in* my State of Health *between the* 6th. and 36th. Year of my Age: † *And to render this credible, you muſt deſcend to Particularities, and ſpecify the moſt remarkable Circumſtances of it; As in what Year*, what *Month*, and what *Day* of the *Month*, I began to be ill: *What Diſturbance it cauſed* in the Family; What Doctors and Surgeons were ſent for, and what they ſaid *pro*, and *con*, about it. *For theſe are the conſtant and natural effects of Changes* in one's Health: *And if any ſuch Changes had really been in mine, in the Interval of Time* above named; *it is as incredible as the moſt palpable of Fictions* that no Notice ſhould be taken of it". Juſt ſo, and in theſe very Words, *mutatis mutandis*, our Author argues about *Changes* in *Religion*. ‡ *They muſt produce plain and undeniable hiſtorical Facts; As in what Age, and under what Popes, and Emperors it happen'd; who were the chief Promoters, and Oppoſers of it; what Diſturbances it cauſed; what Books were writ for, or againſt it; and what Synods were call'd to approve, or condemn it.* O! abſolutely neceſſary it muſt needs be to have every one

---

* P 130 † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

of Theſe Evidences: Otherwiſe there *can be no* Corruptions, tho' we *ſee* there are a thouſand. As if Corruptions could not *begin*, and *creep* on *inſenſibly*, and at laſt ſwell to a *prodigious Bulk*; yet Nobody be able to trace out the *Original*, and *Progreſs* of them. Some indeed *may* be ſo traced; but others may *not*. And therefore our Author gains nothing to his Cauſe, when he tells us that were the* *Primacy* of the See of *Canterbury* pretended to be an Innovation; He who ſhould ſo pretend muſt produce *undeniable hiſtorical Facts* to prove it. For beſides that the *Pope's Supremacy* is not near ſo *plain* and *undiſputed* a Point as the *Archbiſhop of Canterbury's Primacy*; Changes and Innovations of *This Kind* are of ſuch a Nature, that they are more likely to make a Noiſe than Others: Not but that even Theſe *may* be ſo gradual, as not to be taken notice of in Hiſtory. And in Fact, as *Changes* in *Government* are ſometimes ſuddain; ſo they are ſometimes gradual, and made by *imperceptible Yieldances* and *Encroachments*: Yet that they *are* Changes we may be very certain, by comparing the preſent State of Things with the former: And here indeed *Hiſtory* comes in very properly. To as little Purpoſe he cites the † *Arian, Ma-*

* *P* 129, 130. † *P* 134.

cedonian,

cedonian, *Neſtorian*, and *Eutychian* Hereſies condemn'd by *General Councils*. Who doubts but that *ſome* Errors may be ſo *ſuddain* and *flagrant*, as to *allarm* the whole *World* at their *firſt Appearance*? And yet the Caſe may be quite different with *others*. We may be ſure *to a Day* when a Man fell ſick of a *Fever*, or the *Small-Pox*: And yet does it follow, that Another monſtrouſly ſwollen with the *Dropſey*, has *not* the Dropſey; becauſe neither He himſelf, nor any body elſe, can tell *when* the Diſtemper firſt *began*, and by what Advances it *grew* upon him? There is no Neceſſity therefore, as our Author pretends there is, that * We ſhould *inform* them *very particularly who was the firſt Pope that laid claim to the Supremacy*; (tho' we *can* do, and *have* done even *That*:) *Who it was that introduc'd the Invocation of Saints, the Veneration of their Reliques; the Honouring of pious Images* (as he calls them) *and Pictures; and praying for the Souls departed.* Why we muſt ABOVE ALL *let them know who was the firſt Pope that ſaid Maſs; And why This was an Innovation, if it was one, of ſo* EXTRAORDINARY *a Nature, that no Hiſtorian could* POSSIBLY *be ignorant either of it's Beginning, Progreſs, or full Eſta-*

* P. 131

blishment in the Church of Rome, I can by no means understand. What is there so very *particular* in This Instance? And why does he not give us some *Reason* for so *positive* an Assertion? The Word *Mass*, as I have above observ'd, did not always signify the same as it does Now in the Church of *Rome*: And why could not Corruptions, by insensible degrees, one after another, creep into the *Doctrine*, and *Service* of the *Eucharist*, till they swell'd at last to That frightful Size of *Superstition*, *Idolatry*, and *Blasphemy*, which we now behold?

P. 133. Here the Preceptor so batters the *Protestant Cause* with *Questions* and *Dilemmas*; that by the *Noise* of his Cannon, you would think it impossible for us to *hold out* an hour longer. Especially considering how He and his Pupil *triumph* over us, after the formidable Interrogatories are put. * *When These few Questions are clearly answered; I shall have double the Number ready for any one that is dispos'd to undertake that Task.* Dreadful! What will become of us?

G. *I fear indeed there will not be many Pretenders to it. For I perceive there lie Objections in Ambuscade, to what side soever the Answerer shall turn himself.*

---

* *Ibid.*

P.

P. *I believe indeed he will meet with ſome Rubs in his Way.* Well; unfortunately for me, it ſeems, I have undertaken That deſperate Task: And I muſt go on, whatever happens.

* *But This wonderful Change——is either recorded in ſome ancient Hiſtory; or it is not.* Anſwer. *Part* of it *is*, and *Part* is *not.* † *If not; by what means have the bold Aſſertors of it come fairly and honeſtly to the Knowledge of it?*" That Part which is recorded in Hiſtory, *we came fairly and honeſtly to the Knowledge of*, according to his own *Suppoſition:* And we *come fairly and honeſtly to the Knowledge* of the reſt; becauſe we *ſee* it. ‡ *For I ſhould be apt to ſuſpect that they had dealt in the black Art, and conjur'd up ſome Spirit to inform them of what had paſs'd in reference to the pretended Innovations*"—— One may be *Conjurer* enough to *believe* what one *ſees*, without *dealing with the Devil*; And ſo there was no occaſion for That Rant. † *But if it be recorded in any ancient Hiſtory* (*as it muſt undoubtedly be, if it happen'd at all*; which I, to make uſe of the ſame Parentheſis, have ſhewn to be *undoubtedly* falſe, and ridiculous) *I deſire to know when and by what Methods this ſtupendious Revolution was*

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

brought to pass? Tho' for the Reasons above assign'd, He has no Right to ask That Question, nor are we bound to answer it; yet that I may here, as almost every where else, give him more than I owe him, I will follow as he leads. * *As whether it was done clandestinely, or openly? Whether by Violence, or Fraud?* Part of it *clandestinely*; and Part *openly*: Some by *Violence*, some by *Fraud*, and some by *Both.* † *Whether* England, (for, according to my Method, I put *That* instead of *whole Christendom*) *was brib'd, or bully'd, into This strange Apostacy?* It might be in some measure *brib'd* by the Pope's *Money*, tho' That See was always more addicted to *receive* than to *give*; but it was chiefly *bully'd* into it by the Pope's *Bulls.* ‡ *Whether it was compass'd all at once, or by Degrees?* Most certainly *by degrees.* And if the Querist had well consider'd the true Answer to *That* Question; he need not have been at the Trouble of asking *the rest.* * *And whether it met with any Opposition, or not?* Several Parts of it, as the Pope's Supremacy, and Image-Worship, met with *much* Opposition: Some met with but *little*; Others stealing in by *Moonlight*, or in the *Dark*, or by *insensible Degrees*, might meet with *none.* I

P. *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

think

think our Cauſe remains unhurt by all Theſe terrible Interrogatories, notwithſtanding the loud Bluſtring above recited; Which proves to be Powder without Ball, *Noiſe* and *nothing elſe*.

In This and the four next Pages, * he may, without any diſturbance from Me, as he has done in the foregoing Page, † and Part of the next preceding it, proceed manfully *fighting with his own Shadow*; proving, and *demonſtrating*, that there was no *Change* in the *Faith* of *Rome*, between *Eleutherius*'s, and *Gregory*'s Time: Of which I have ſaid enough, perhaps more than enough, already.

There is, however, in the laſt of theſe Pages one Aſſertion which is very material, and muſt by no means be neglected.—— *St.* Auguſtin (ſays he) *who brought from* Rome, *and preach'd to the* Saxons, ALL *the Papiſtical Doctrines we now profeſs*. To which I anſwer; He himſelf has mention'd but *ſix*: to wit, 1. The Pope's Supremacy. 2. Saying Maſs. 3. The Uſe of holy Water. 4. The Worſhip of the Croſs, Images, and Reliques. 5. Invocation of Saints. 6. Purgatory. The firſt five of Theſe ſix were not held by the Church of *Rome*, nor by Pope *Gregory* himſelf; Nor has our Author (as I have

* *P.* 134, 135, 136, 137. † P. 132.

shewn) brought any more than the Shadow of an Argument at most, to prove that any *one* of them *was*; Nay I have prov'd that two of them, The Pope's Supremacy, and Worshipping the Cross, &c. were *not*. The last of them, Purgatory, was indeed held by Pope *Gregory*, but not by the Church of *Rome*; Nor does it appear that *Austin* in particular either *preach'd*, or *believ'd* it. But suppose every one of *These* Points was then maintain'd by the Church of *Rome* in general, and brought into *England* by *Austin:* Are These ALL *the Papistical Points which* Papists *now profess*? Where are the Seven Sacraments; Communion in one Kind; Denying the Laity the Use of the Scriptures; Prayers in an unknown Tongue; Exempting the Clergy from Civil Jurisdiction; The Doctrine of excommunicating and deposing Kings; Their innumerable Ceremonies and Superstitious Fopperies; Their Doctrines entirely calculated for the *Damnation of Souls*, as Attrition without Contrition, Auricular Confession, and *Opus operatum*: Lastly, and to omit a multitude more, Their Doctrine of Indulgencies, and the Sale of them, consequent of it; as appears from That filthy Book call'd the *Tax of the Apostolical Chamber*, or *Chancery*, in " which (as * one of

* *Espencæus* in Epist. ad Tit. C. 1. P. 479.

of

" of their own Writers aſſures us) may be " learn'd more ſorts of Wickedneſs than " from all the Summaries of all Vices; and " a *Licence* for *ſome*, but *Abſolution* for " *all* (many of them are ſo horrid and un- " natural that they are not to be named " without Immodeſty) is offered to thoſe who " deſire to buy them"? In this precious *Book of Rates*, the ſeveral Prices of the Indulgencies, and Pardons, are annexed to them, according to the magnitude of the ſeveral Sins; As for *Murder*, ſo much; For *Adultery*, ſo much; For *Perjury* ſo much. Our Author therefore was a little Forgetful, or guilty of a wilful *imperfect Enumeration*; when, even according to his own Account, he affirm'd that St. *Auguſtin* brought ALL the Papiſtical Doctrines into *England*.

To the Ninth SECTION:

ENTITLED

The ſame Subject continued.

* HOW far our Author *does* and does *not* agree with Mr. *Collier*, is nothing to Me, or to our Cauſe. He elſewhere produces a Quotation † from That Hiſtorian,

* P. 138. † Of which hereafter in The 3d. Dialogue.

with

with reference to which I differ from Mr. *Collier*, as well as from *Him*: But in This neither the Church of *England*, nor the Church of *Rome*, is conern'd. Here, however, he is unjuſt in accuſing Mr. *Collier* of *Inſincerity*, for *telling his Reader* that of the *Articles* propos'd by *Auſtin* to the *Britiſh* Biſhops, *Owning the Pope's Authority* was one: * *Whereas* (ſays our Author) *There is not a Word of this Article in* Bede. But can nothing be true, but what is in *Bede*? Beſides; our Author afterwards acknowledges that Mr. *C.* endeavours at leaſt to prove his Aſſertion frome *Bede* himſelf; and takes a great deal of Pains to anſwer the Argument: With what ſucceſs we ſhall ſee preſently.

In the mean time † he owns that *Geoffry* of *Monmouth* an *antient Hiſtorian*—— *ſpeaks of* Dinoth *the Abbot of* Bangor, *as Prolocutor of the Aſſembly on the* Britiſh *Side; and tells us that the Anſwer he gave to St.* Auſtin's *Propoſals was, that the Britons ow'd no Subjection to him, as having an Archbiſhop of their own.* In This Anſwer, our Author is poſitive, there is not ‖ *the leaſt Inſinuation* that St *Auſtin* had *inſiſted on their owning the Pope's Supremacy.* Supremacy, *univerſal* Supremacy, We do not ſay Pope *Gregory* pretended to;

* Ibid. † Ibid. ‖ P. 139.

nay

nay We have ſhewn that he diſclaim'd it: But as to *Authority*, or *Juriſdiction* in *Britain*; to my Apprehenſion, there is in This Anſwer of *Dinoth*'s a *little Inſinuation* that *Auſtin* had mention'd ſome ſuch Thing. But let That paſs; together with our Author's Reaſonings in all this Paragraph: Which I leave him to enjoy without Diſturbance.

But the *Welſh Manuſcript* cited by Sir *Henry Spelman* is expreſs for *Dinoth*'s abſolutely rejecting the Pope's Authority. And how Mr. *C.* * gives *Bede* the *ſlip*, in quoting This Manuſcript, I do not underſtand; Or if it muſt be call'd by That Name, I am as much at a Loſs to know what harm there is in it. Becauſe I quote *one* Hiſtorian, *as far as he goes*; is there any thing abſurd, or unfair, in my quoting *another*, to *ſupply* his *defects*? For the Authority of this Manuſcript, about which the Preceptor is not ſatisfy'd, I refer to Sir *Henry Spelman*, who lays no more Weight upon it than it will bear: Whether it be true, or falſe, matters not much: Sir *Henry*, however, produces another Manuſcript to the ſame Purpoſe; which ſeems of more undoubted Authority.

But it is moſt probable, at leaſt, from *Bede* himſelf, that the *Britiſh Biſhops* refus'd all manner of Submiſſion to the Pope: And that They did, is confirm'd by the

* Ibid.

Teſtimony

Teſtimony of other Hiſtorians. From *Bede* himſelf, I ſay, it is at leaſt highly probable: becauſe he aſſures us that Thoſe Prelates refus'd to acknowledge *Auſtin* as their *Archbiſhop*. * But *This Argument*, our Author tells us, *will not hold Water*. *For tho' it be true indeed that the* Britons *refus'd to receive St.* Auguſtin *for their Archbiſhop; it does not follow from it that therefore they diſown'd the Pope's Supremacy*. And the Reaſon of This is, becauſe they might own his *Supremacy*, without owning that † *his Authority extended to the placing one as an ordinary Superior over their own Archbiſhop*. That is to ſay, This Writer gives us *his own Arbitrary* Notion of the Supremacy, enlarges it, or contracts it, as he thinks fit; of which I have above taken notice; and is for a *limited* Pope's *Supremacy*, which I have elſewhere ‡ ſhewn to be abſurd. What Thanks he will receive for this from other *Romaniſts*, is not difficult to gueſs. But 'tis pleaſant enough to hear *any* Papiſt uſe Theſe Words: ‖ *Becauſe they might think that the Pope had carried his Pretenſions too high; in degrading, as it were, their own Archbiſhop, and ſubjecting both Him, and Them to a* FOREIGN JURISDICTION. Is the Pope a Native of Great *Britain*? Or the

---

* P. 141. † Ibid. ‡ Pop. truly ſtated. ‖ P. 141.

See

See of *Rome* a *Britiſh* See? Is not the Papal Juriſdiction then as to Us, if it be any thing at all, a *foreign* Juriſdiction? But be That as it will; All the World knows, that, ſince What we call Popery was fully eſtabliſh'd, the Papal Supremacy was both by thoſe who *claim'd* it, and by thoſe who *acknowledg'd* it, eſteem'd *abſolute* and *unlimited*: And 'tis no leſs certain that *Auſtin* thought the Pope had Authority to *place an ordinary Superior*, and that a *foreign* one too, *over an Archbiſhop*. This Writer himſelf acknowledges as much. St. *Auguſtin* (ſays He *) *doubtleſs thought himſelf their Metropolitan, and Primate*; ſpeaking of the *Britiſh* Biſhops: And that he claim'd under the Pope, is moſt certain, and this Writer himſelf again once † expreſly affirms, and all along ſuppoſes. 'Tis true he twice tells us ‡ *he will not preſume to decide* whether his Title were good, or not. And yet he *ſeems to decide* it; when he ſays, ‖ *ſhould He* (the Pope) *take upon him to ſend over a foreign Archbiſhop with a Commiſſion to exerciſe an ordinary Juriſdiction over the Archbiſhop of* Prague, Toledo, *or* Paris, *for example*; *he would be as vigorouſly oppoſed now, as St.* Auguſtin *was by the* Britiſh *Clergy*; *and in all*

---

* *P.* 107. † *P.* 95. ‡ *P.* 107. and 144. ‖ P. 141.

Likelihood

Likelihood be ſent back with the ſame Anſwer as that Prelate was, to wit, That they would not receive him as their Archbiſhop. It ſeems then *Bohemia*, *Spain*, and *France*, would not acknowledge ſuch a Power in the Pope; And our Author, one would think, is of Opinion that they have Reaſon. Elſe, why does he alledge their Authority? At leaſt he grants that ſuch *is* their Opinion: And even according to That, Popery is not in all reſpects the ſame now as the Doctrine which *Auſtin* taught; tho' This Writer ſtrenuouſly inſiſts that it is. I ſay again, St. *Auſtin* (according to our Author himſelf) thought the Pope had a Right to make him *ordinary Superior* to the *Britiſh* Archbiſhop; For he claim'd under That ſuppoſed Right. And conſidering, as I obſerv'd, that the Pope's Supremacy was, after the thorough Eſtabliſhment of Popery, ever accounted abſolutely Monarchical; it follows that by rejecting *any* of his Authority, They rejected *ſuch* a *Supremacy* as the *Popiſh* Church of *Rome* has generally aſcrib'd to the Pope, and Popes to themſelves; whether *Gregory* I. laid Claim to it, or no.

* *I only add*, ſays He, *that there are innumerable Inſtances in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of particular Churches, maintaining*

---

* *P.* 142.

their

their Privileges againſt the See of Rome. There are indeed: and this is a frank Confeſſion. * *And That without derogating any more from the* divine Right *of the Pope's Supremacy, than a Subject is ſuppoſed to derogate from the juſt Prerogative of the Crown when he goes to Law with his Sovereign.* I tell him again, the Pope's Supremacy is by the Popes and the Church of *Rome* maintain'd to be an *abſolute Monarchy*; and therefore This is no Parallel. In *England* a Man may go to Law with his Sovereign; becauſe the *Engliſh* Monarchy is a limited one. But is it ſo in *Turkey* or *Muſcovy*? As for the Authority of † a *Father* over his *Son*, it is more limited than *any* Monarchy. Not that I am of this Writer's Opinion, that a *Son* may lawfully *refuſe to obey a Command* of his Father, which only APPEARS UNREASONABLE *to him*: I think a Father's Authority extends a great deal farther than That comes to. If the Son acts thus, he really ‡ *diſowns the Authority his Father has by Nature over him.*

Upon the Whole of This Matter, concerning *Auſtin*, *Dinoth*, and the *Britiſh* Prelates; I refer the Reader to Sir *Henry Spelman*, Counc. Anno 601. *Bede*, Hiſt.

---

* Ibid. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid.

Lib 1, 2. *Geof.* of *Monm.* Lib. 11. *Bramhall*, Juſt Vindication, *&c.* P. 84. Schiſm Guarded P.269. *Stillingfleet*, Antiq. of Brit. Churches, Chap. 5. *&c.* Adding only this Obſervation, that were what our Author ſays of it really true; it would but invalidate *one ſingle* Argument of Ours, among *very many* others which are unanſwerable; or at moſt would amount to no more than that one Point of Popery, among a hundred, is a little *older* than We affirm: Which will never be a Ballance even in Behalf of That ſingle Point the *Pope's Supremacy*, againſt Thoſe innumerable demonſtrative Arguments which utterly overturn and deſtroy it,

His ſaying that * *perhaps neither St.* Gregory, *not the* Britiſh *Biſhops were in the Wrong*, as to this Notion of the extent of the Papal Power; becauſe *Both* might *think* they had *Reaſon on their* Side; when they are ſuppoſed to have been of directly contrary Opinions; is what I can by no means account for, and ſo I leave it.

Nor does it follow, † that becauſe Mr. *C.* ſays, *If* Gregory's *Succeſſors had mov'd within the Compaſs of his Pretenſions, the Diviſions of Chriſtendom might have been prevented*: Therefore *it was his Judgment*

---

* P. 143. † Ibid.

that

that St. Gregory *did not carry his Pretenſions to any exceſs, when he conſtituted St.* Auguſtin *Superior over the* Britiſh *Biſhops.* For, tho' Mr. *C.* expreſſes himſelf ſomewhat looſely; Thoſe Pretenſions in *Greogory* might be exceſſive, as they certainly were, and yet if his Succeſſors had not proceeded to *greater* Exceſſes, *ſuch* Diviſions in Chriſtendom, as have ſince actually happen'd, might have been prevented. * *And as to the Doctrine taught by That Saint* (continues He) *I appeal to Mr.* C's *own Conſcience, whether Roman Catholicks, or Proteſtants keep cloſer to it.* And I wonder at *Thy Conſcience*, whoever thou art, for making ſuch an Appeal to another Man's: Which is as much as I need ſay of it, after what I have largely diſcours'd upon That Subject.

† His affirming, that *Gregory* had *the paſtoral Care of all Churches incumbent upon him*; Calling the *Britiſh* Church *an antient part of* His *Flock*; And talking of *placing a Superior over it, with* FULL POWERS *to reform it*; is all reducible to the old Popiſh Way of Argumentation, *Begging the Queſtion*, which I have often taken notice of.

---

* Ibid. † Ibid.

From P. 144, to P. 148. He is upon the old *wrong Scent*, proving what Nobody denys (meaning always in the main) that *the same Faith was preach'd to the* Britons, *and* Saxons: Of which more than enough already. It were indeed very easy to shew what trifling Arguments he produces to prove even This; and how many ridiculous things he says upon it. But I have something else to do with my Time than to *expose* Him, and his Reasonings; unless when it is *necessary*, or at least *highly expedient*.

I only observe therefore, that tho' what * he tells us from *Bede*, of St. *German*, and St. *Lupus*, about the Year 440, working a *Miracle by a Box of Reliques* &c. is a Fact which I do not believe, for we are not bound to believe every thing *Bede* says; yet admitting it were true, This does not ‡ *savour* so *rank of modern Popery*, as he supposes: Because God may work a *Miracle* upon a Person, when a *Box of Reliques* is *apply'd* to him; and yet it does not follow that *Reliques may be ador'd*. As for † the Story of St. *Alban's* Blood *&c.* tho' here again we are not obliged to believe the Fact; I have already granted that the *superstitious Use* of *Reliques* was *pretty early* in the Church; and let our Author make

* *P.* 147. ‡ Ibid. † Ibid.

the

the moſt of it. The *Worſhip* of them, concerning which nothing is here ſaid is much *later*. Not but that it would be *unlawful*, tho' it were never ſo *early*.

P. 148. *To Conclude, I argue thus from the Premiſes I have eſtabliſh'd, The* Engliſh *Roman Catholicks profeſs the ſame Faith now, as was preach'd by St* Auguſtin —— *But the Faith preach'd by St*, Auguſtin *was* —— *the ſame that St.* Fugatius *and* Damianus *preach'd* —— *Therefore*, &c. In ſhort, he ſums up his Argument as I have done in the Beginning of my Anſwer to This Section. P. 171, 172. And then adds; *If This argument be not concluſive; I deſire to know where the Defect of it lies.* I tell him where it lies: It lies chiefly, tho' not ſolely, in the firſt Propoſition. The *Engliſh* Roman Catholicks do *not* profeſs the ſame Faith now, as was preach'd by St. *Auſtin* above *eleven hundred Years ago.* This I have largely, and fully prov'd: And let him anſwer it, if he is able. Nor is the ſecond Propoſition *altogether* true; tho' upon That we do not inſiſt. He ſubjoins, *But if it be concluſive, as I conceive it is; the Reform'd Churches are in a defenceleſs Condition; as being convicted of teaching, in every Article wherein they differ from the Church of* Rome, *a Doctrine directly contrary to That of the primitive Church.* I anſwer; But if it be *not* concluſive, as I have

prov'd it is not; and if the direct *Contrary* be *true*, as I have *prov'd* it *is*; Then " the " *Popiſh* Churches are in a defenceleſs Con- " dition, as being convicted of teaching, in " every Article wherein they differ from " *the Reform'd* Churches, a Doctrine di- " rectly contrary to That of the Primitive " Church".

To the Tenth SECTION:

ENTITULED,

Some Obſervations upon the Converſion of England *under Pope* Gregory.

THIS, like ſeveral Others of our Author's Sections, is ſoon diſpatch'd; becauſe it contains nothing but what is elſewhere more largely inſiſted upon: He only repeats what is paſt, and threatens us with what is to come. His main Drift is to ſet the *Means* of *England's Converſion* and Thoſe of it's *Reformation* againſt each other, as if they were directly oppoſite; in order to blacken and calumniate the Latter. This Slander ſhall be fully conſidered in our Examination of the *Next Dialogue*; to which the

the Concluſion of *This* is a Kind of Preparation or Introduction. Here therefore I have nothing to do, but to make a few *curſory Strictures* upon particular Paſſages; without *repeating* what has been ſaid *already*, or *foreſtalling* what ſhall be ſaid *hereafter*.

That Pope *Gregory*, or any other Pope, * *was the undoubted Succeſſor* of St. *Peter*, in the Senſe which Papiſts uſually mean, is falſe; as I have prov'd in another Treatiſe. That he had his Authority, as Biſhop, from the Apoſtles, and ſo from Chriſt, and that the Miſſionaries he ſent were legally ordain'd, and authoriz'd, I readily grant: But that the Proteſtant Biſhops were not, and are not ſo, which is what our Author would inſinuate, I abſolutely and totally deny. It has been often *demonſtrated* that Our *Orders* are as good as Theirs.

His Declamation † upon Pope *Gregory*'s Character is immaterial to the Controverſy, and not all together true, as I have ſhewn. His asking whether it be better ‖ to *venture one*'s Soul with St. *Gregory*, or with *our Reformers*, is fallacious, as I have likewiſe ſhewn; becauſe there is not That *Oppoſition* between them, which He ſuppoſes. After what I have abundantly made out in my

---

* P. 149. † P. 150. ‖ *Ibid.*

Answer to this Dialogue; let the Reader observe what a mixture of *Truth*, and *Charity* there is in These Words, which our Author puts into the Mouth of his young Gentlemen. * *For if true Faith be necessary to Salvation, as you have prov'd it to be; I really believe the Company of those Gentlemen* [meaning the Protestants] *who apostatized from the Faith taught by St.* Gregory, *and is faithful Disciple St.* Augustin, *is not much to be coveted in another World.* They, not We, *corrupted* the Religion taught by *Gregory* and *Austin*; and God give them Grace to *reform* it.

The Protestant Churches in general did not † *by their pretended Reformation divide themselves from all the pre-existing Churches in Christendom*, as to *Faith* and *Doctrine*; nor the Church of *England* in particular, either as to *Doctrine*, or *Discipline:* Of which, when we come to the Fourth Dialogue.

Our pretended Breach ‡ of the *Unity of Faith* shall there too be consider'd.

He enlarges upon || St. *Austin*'s Miracles, by way of Reflection upon Us for the want of them at the Reformation: Of which likewise in the Fourth Dialogue. Here I only take notice that his Harangue for a whole

---

* P. 151. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid. || Ibid. and P. 152.

Page together upon the Uſefulneſs, and Neceſſity of Miracles to eſtabliſh *newly reveal'd Truths* is extremely impertinent; And his ſaying that *Auſtin*'s Miracles, tho' ſuppos'd to be true, and genuine, * *have not the divine Authority of Scriptural Miracles, is* flat Nonſenſe.

† *It is the diſtinguiſhing Character*, He ſays, *of Falſhood to eſtabliſh itſelf by Violence and Impoſture.* Nothing more certain: And ſo Popery, not Proteſtantiſm, eſtabliſh'd it ſelf. The Confidence, and Folly of the Man is prodigious. With the ſame Blindneſs and Infatuation, as if he had owed himſelf a Shame, he reflects upon the Reformation, for ‡ *domineering, and tyranizing over Men's Faith.* This to Us! And from a *Papiſt*! The main Deſign of *his* Book is to defend ſuch *Tyranizing*; And of *mine*, to *deſtroy* it.

His redoubted Dilemma || *Either therefore, the Church whereof* England *became a Part, was then the true Church*, &c. tho' it has, in effect, been more than once anſwered before, ſhall not fail to be taken in pieces, in a more proper place; For (ſo great is this Writer's Love of Tautology) it is, to my no ſmall Mortification, more than once repeated.

---

* *P.* 153. † *Ibid.* ‡ *P.* 157. || *P.* 155, 156.

†His Rhetorication against the *Rapine* and *Violence* of Those he calls *Reformers*, (for all of them were not really such) and then asking whether the *Holy Ghost could have a Part in such Councils*, meaning indiscriminately Those of the Reformation, is That *stupid Fallacy* by which *several Questions* which ought to be *separated*, are jumbled together in *One*. As This is often repeated by Him, and his trusty Ally the Bishop of *Meaux*; I will here give a short Answer to it, for good and all. What was *ill* either *about*, or *at*, the time of the Reformation, the *Holy Ghost* had *no* part in: What was *good* He *had* a part in. * *God was not in* the *great Wind*, the *Earthquake*, and the *Fire*, which demolish'd all Religious Houses without Distinction, and strip'd the Church of its Revenues; which was the Work of Papists, not of Protestants: All in a manner, I mean; all the *Former*, and at least nineteen parts in twenty of the *Latter*: But He *was in the still small Voice* of the Scriptures, dictating, and prescribing a Reformation of Religion: And had the WHOLE *English* Nation then listen'd to the *Last*, as it ought to have done; all the Mischiefs, and Confusions occasion'd by the *Other Three* would most certainly have been prevented.

---

† P. 159. * 1 *Kings* 19.

AN

ANSWER

TO A

Popiſh BOOK:

ENTITULED,

ENGLAND's *Converſion and Reformation compar'd*, &c.

To the Third DIALOGUE: *And The* PREFACE.

SINCE the Subject of our Author's Preface, and of his Third Dialogue is the ſame; I choſe to conſider them together, that I might avoid Repetition as much as poſſible. For this Reaſon, and moreover becauſe a very great Part of what He advances, even ſeveral

ſeveral long Sections entire, may as well be anſwer'd in ten Lines, as in ten thouſand; I here depart from the Method I have hitherto obſerv'd, which was to follow him Section by Section. But I ſhall, notwithſtanding, be ſo far from diſſembling or avoiding, the Force of any one of his Arguments; that I ſhall, if poſſible, be more particular here, than any where elſe.

The Subſtance of all the Facts contain'd in his Preface, and in This Dialogue, may be reduc'd to the two following Heads.

I. That the *Agents* in our *Reformation* were Perſons of wicked and ſcandalous Lives.

II. That it was begun, and carry'd on, by unlawful *Means*, and an incompetent *Authority*; by *Force*, and *Violence*; and the Encroachments of the Civil State, invading the Spiritual Rights of the Church and Clergy.

And all This is averr'd to be taken from our *own Writers*, from *Proteſtant Hiſtorians*; * Upon which our Author, and his young Gentleman, triumph exceedingly. But beſides, that there is a much *worſe* Account given of *wicked Popes*, and the *Wickedneſs* of the *Romiſh* Church in general, both Clergy, and Laity, by THEIR *own Writers*, by *Roman Catholick Hiſto-*

* P. 161.

rians

rians; Among the many Facts pretended to be quoted by our Author, and the Biſhop of *Meaux*, from *Heylin*, *Burnet*, and the reſt, there is ſcarce one but is either *falſe quoted*, or *miſtaken*, or *wilfully miſrepreſented*, or made the Foundation of an *inconcluſive* Argument: *Few* of them are to the *Purpoſe*; and *one* general *wrong Conſequence* is drawn from them *All*.

I. For the Firſt of theſe Heads; our Author, aſſiſted by the Biſhop of *Meaux*, revives the old *perſonal Scandals*, which have ſo long been made uſe of to caſt an *Odium* upon the *Reformation*. Some of the Allegations are true in the Groſs; tho' moſt, if not all, of them highly agravated and miſrepreſented by our Adverſaries. If, on the Contrary, Biſhop *Burnet*, or any other Writer, has been too laviſh in his * *Praiſes*, (or *Boaſts*, if you will call them ſo) of *Perſons acting*, and *Meaſures taken* at That Time; Let the Romaniſts animadvert upon it, and much good may it do them. What is all This to the Point? How does it prove Our Religion to be Falſe, or Theirs to be true? I ſhall ſhew in due time that it is foreign to the Cauſe, and that the Conſequence they draw from it is ground-

* Pref. P. 11. and 54. Third Dial. *paſſim*.

leſs

leſs. The Falſity of the Conſequence drawn from the Facts is what I chiefly inſiſt upon: Yet I ſhall firſt touch upon the Facts themſelves.

The Biſhop of *Meaux*, ſpeaking of *Henry* VIII. has theſe Words. * *Whatever Mr.* Burnet *is pleaſed to ſay, we are not diſpoſed to accept of the Communion which he ſeems to offer us of that Prince. And ſince he throws him out of his own; the immediate Conſequence is, that the firſt Author of the* Engliſh *Reformation, who in reality laid the Foundation of it, by the Hatred he inſtill'd into his Subjects againſt the Pope, and the Church of* Rome, *is a Perſon equally rejected, and anathematiz'd by both Parties.*" Not *anathematiz'd* by *Us*, tho' by the Church of *Rome*: But let That paſs. We have † elſewhere a Reaſon given us (and I have ‡ elſewhere conſider'd it) why he was not of Their Communion; namely, becauſe he caſt off the Pope's Supremacy, the Acknowledgment of which is neceſſary to make a Member of their Church. We do not ſay he was in Communion with the *Romiſh* Church; He was excommunicated, tho' he never intended to ſeparate, from it. But we do ſay, and inſiſt, that he was chiefly of the *Romiſh* Religion; and our Author

* Pref. P. 10. † *P.* 119. ‡ *P.* 216.

himſelf

himſelf affirms that * *he continued in moſt things a Zealous Papiſt to the laſt.* And ſo far was he from intending the Reformation which follow'd; that he liv'd and dy'd a fiery Bigot to the worſt of Popiſh Corruptions, and a Perſecutor to Death of Thoſe who declar'd againſt them. He was, it is true, an Inſtrument of the Reformation in God's Hand, but not by any Deſign of his own. He was not therefore in any Propriety of Speech the *Author*, however he might be the *Occaſion* of it: And his *laying the Foundation* of it was owing not to his Intention, but to Divine Providence. When the Biſhop of *Meaux* therefore couples the *Pope* and the *Church* of *Rome* together, as if King *Henry inſtill'd into his Subjects* an equal *Hatred* of both; He is guilty of a great Fallacy, or under a great Miſtake.

Archbiſhop *Cranmer*, I grant, was more than a bare Inſtrument in That Work: He heartily wiſh'd well *to* it, and induſtriouſly labour'd *in* it. And if he has been too much extoll'd by Biſhop *Burnet*, and Others; He has been too much blacken'd by this Writer, and his Party. Be That as it will; he at laſt laid down his Life for his Religion; which, it is hop'd, may be ſome Anſwer to the Charge of *Hypocriſy*, and *Inſincerity* † ſo heavily laid againſt him.

* P. 215. † Pref. and 3d. Dial. *paſſim.*

Upon

Upon the Subject of *Cranmer*'s Sincerity, our Author gives us a remarkable Specimen of his Own. From the Incident of That Martyr's Heart not being burnt when his Body was consum'd to Ashes, † he tells us Bishop *Burnet* CONCLUDES, *that tho' his Hand err'd yet his Heart had continued true.* For this he quotes P. 335 of *Burnet*'s History; and the young Gentleman is very sharp in exposing the *Nonsense, and Contradiction* of it. Now Bishop *Burnet*'s Words are These. *Which tho' the Reform'd would not carry so far, as to make a Miracle of it, and a clear Proof that his Heart had continued true, tho' his Hand err'd; yet they objected it to the Papists that it was certainly such a Thing, that if it had fallen out in any of their Church, they had made it a Miracle.* So that he makes no such Conclusion as our Author pretends; He only says that the Reform'd would *not* make it. This is the Gentleman who so loudly complains of our *Insincerity*, and *Unfair Dealing*.

Nor do I see in P. 92. of the same History quoted by our Author ‖ that Bishop *Burnet* says "*Cranmer* was a *Lutheran* in "his Heart even when He was a private "Fellow in the University of *Cambridge*." It is said indeed P. 79. Vol. I. that, "He "marry'd when he was Fellow of *Jesus*-

† P. 181. ‖ P. 175, 176.

"College

" College in *Cambridge*, and loſt his Fel-
" lowſhip upon it." But if this prov'd him a *Lutheran*, he was one openly: And He openly oppos'd the *Six Articles* in King *Henry*'s Reign; which I think was a Proof of ſome Sincerity. As for his Recanting, when he was under the Sentence of Condemnation, which our Author baſely calls * *twice perjuring himſelf*, and inhumanly triumphs over; common Charity would aſcribe it to human Infirmity wrought upon by the Fear of Death; ſince he *recanted his Recantation*, voluntarily burnt off the Hand that ſign'd it, and ſealed his former Profeſſion with his Blood.

Under the ſame Article of *Sincerity* we may remark, that as our Author, and the Biſhop of *Meaux*, take notice from Biſhop *Burnet* † of *Cranmer's extravagant Doctrine touching Church Governmet*; it would have became them to have taken notice from the ſame Writer, of his formally *retracting* it; without Thoſe little fallacious Reaſonings they make uſe of, to invalidate the Force and Credit of That Retractation.

But ſuppoſe *Cranmer* to have been as falſe, and hypocritical, in carrying on the Reformation, as They would have him; Theſe Objections come with an ill Grace from the Mouths of Papiſts; whoſe Doctrine it is that

* P. 180. † Pref. P. 23, 24.

the

the Intereſt of Holy Church, and the true Religion, ſhould be ſupported by any Means, and at any Rate. *Cranmer*, it may be, might for ſome time retain ſo much Popery, as to proceed upon this Principle.

As for the long Story about † K. *Harry*'s Divorce; I anſwer in ſhort (tho' 'tis as full an Anſwer, as if it took up a large *Folio*) that he was a Papiſt all the while. And if He ‡ *gave Bribes* to Divines and Univerſities upon That occaſion; They were Papiſts who *took* them.

The *Plunder* of the *Church* likewiſe in That Reign, which was fifty times more than in all *other* Reigns, was the Work of Papiſts.

The *Diſſolution* of *Monaſteries* was *ſolely* in That Reign; ſet on foot by Cardinal *Woolſey*, carry'd on, and finiſh'd by a Popiſh King, and Parliament. Not but that the Action in the main was good, tho' accompany'd with many Abuſes. The Number and over-grown Wealth of Thoſe *Religious Houſes* as they were call'd (tho' ſome few of them perhaps might well enough have been ſpar'd) was grown a Burthen inſupportable to the Nation: They were miſchievous both to the *Civil State*, and to *Religion*;

† 3d. Dial. 1ſt, 2d, and 3d. Sections throughout. Pref. *paſſim*. ‡ P. 28.

and

and ſtill are ſo in Popiſh Countries. And notwithſtanding our Author's long Quotation from * Sir *William Dugdale*; it were eaſy to prove from good Authors, even from Sir *William Dugdale* Himſelf, that the *Inhabitants* of them were not generally ſo *chaſte*, and *unblameable* in their Lives and Converſations, as they are by Some repreſented.

† *The frequent and promiſcuous Executions of Proteſtants as well as Catholicks under this Sanguinary Prince* are, I confeſs, *known to all Mankind*. But it is as well known that *This Sanguinary Prince* executed Proteſtants for *being* Proteſtants; Catholicks, as They are call'd, not for *being* Catholicks, but for denying his Supremacy, and aſſerting the Pope's. He *hang'd Papiſts* for Crimes againſt himſelf; but *burnt Proteſtants* for *being Proteſtants*.

‡ In *Edward* the Sixth's Reign, they tell us that the Duke of *Somerſet*, Lord Protector, was a very wicked Man; and carry'd on the Reformation with no View, but to advance his own Worldly *Intereſt*; That the *Revenues* of the *Church* were further *retrench'd*, and *Churches ſpoil'd of their rich Ornaments*, to furniſh the Houſes of Cour-

* Sect. 5. P. 195. † Pref. P16. ‡ Sect. 7, 8. Pref. P.30. &c.

tiers, and great Men: That † Queen *Elizabeth* was a *perfidious*, *hypocritical*, *cruel* Woman, not without many a Reflection upon her *Chaſtity*; that ſhe *ſtrip'd* the *Church* yet further; that ſhe had the moſt wicked *Miniſtry* that ever liv'd; that ſhe *fomented* the *Rebellion* of the *Scots* againſt their Sovereign; and that the Death of the Queen of *Scots* is an indelible Stain upon her Character. Here we have a mixture of Truth and Falſhood. The Duke of *Somerſet*, I believe, was no very good Man; and the Principle upon which he acted in the Reformation might, for ought I know, be none of the beſt. Tho', as I may here very well obſerve, (and the Obſervation is applicable to other Agents in This great Work, as well as to the Duke of *Somerſet*) it by no means follows that becauſe ſuch or ſuch a Thing is the natural and certain Conſequence of This, or That Action, therefore a Man muſt neceſſarily propoſe That Thing as the end of That Action. The Duke of *Somerſet*'s Power, and Fortune, might be increaſed by the Reformation; and yet he might promote it upon a quite different, and far better Principle. And this Reaſoning will hold much ſtronger, when it is apply'd to Perſons of an *unblemiſh'd* Character, or of

† Sect. 9. and *paſſim*, Pref. P. 42, 43. &c.

whoſe

whoſe Characters we *know nothing*: Of which more hereafter. Whoever apply'd the Materials, Utenſils, or Ornaments of Churches to private and common Uſes, as particularly in the famous Caſe of Building *Somerſet-Houſe* † ſo much inſiſted upon, was guilty of Profaneneſs, and Sacrilege. But let Thoſe who did it anſwer for it: What is it to Us, or our Religion? Thoſe who alienated the Revenues of the Church, purſued the Path which the Papiſts had mark'd out for them; and did very ill, I think. Queen *Elizabeth* was certainly not all Perfection, as ſome Proteſtants perhaps have repreſented her; but it is as certain that She was not ſo black as the Papiſts have painted her; according to whom the Devil himſelf cannot well be blacker. The Death of the Queen of *Scots*, in particular, is too much aggravated. For after all, tho' ſhe had hard Meaſure; ſhe was not entirely *innocent*: And the reſtleſs Attempts, Plots, and Treaſons, of the Popiſh Faction may at leaſt in ſome Degree excuſe Queen *Elizabeth*'s extorted Conſent to the Death of That unhappy Princeſs. But to put it at the Worſt, we can prove, and have prov'd, both from Reaſon, and Scripture, that ſhe did well as a *Reformer*; but are not bound to juſtify all her Actions as a *Queen* and a *Politician*.

† P. 221.

But ſuppoſing Her, and all the reſt of the Reformers *particularly nam'd* by our Author, to have been as bad as he makes them: There were very *many other* great Men who acted in it; and were they all alike? This charitable Gentleman would have it believ'd that they were. * *And what is moſt remarkable* (ſays He) *we have not found one ſingle Perſon of Note concern'd in the promoting of his ſo much boaſted Work of Light, whoſe Character would not at any time be a Scandal to a Cauſe of far leſs Moment*, &c. What if we had not *found* one ſuch, that is, upon Record, in Hiſtory, and mention'd by Name? Both Houſes of Parliament, and Convocation, the Judges, and great Officers of State, were deeply concern'd in promoting This Work; and was there not one ſingle Perſon of Note among them? Sure, to ſpeak modeſtly, there could not be leſs than Fifty, in the three Reforming Reigns put together: And was not there one among them, but would have been a Scandal to any Cauſe? (For 'tis Begging the Queſtion to ſay they were Profligates *becauſe* they were *Reformers.*) Is ſuch a Thing to be ſuppoſed in common Charity, or even to be conceived in common Reaſon? But beſides; as it happens, we *have* found ſeveral *Righteous Perſons* in the *City* which our Author repre-

* Pref. P. 55.

ſents

ſents to have been worſe than *Sodom*. The Compilers of the Common Prayer, whoſe Names are upon Record, were Men of *Note*, and of *Piety* too: Dr. *Heylin*, whom This Writer often quotes, tells us they were * *Men famous in their Generation, and the honour of the Age they liv'd in.* So were many who promoted the Reformation, by ſuffering Martyrdom for it. All Theſe were not a Scandal to their Cauſe. What thinks our Author of *Edward* VI. and the Lady *Jane Grey*? The laſt, I ſuppoſe, He will ſay was a Rebel and Uſurper: But it is well known how ſhe may be at leaſt *excus'd* as to That Matter: In other reſpects, ſhe was a Prodigy of Wiſdom, Learning, and Piety. And ſo was *Edward* VI. Who, that I may here obſerve it once for all, was not ſo *very a Child*, as our Author all along repreſents him. Even when he came to the Crown, he was much more than juſt *of an Age to begin to learn his Catechiſm*: He was between ten and eleven Years old; and could not only ſay his Catechiſm, but in a great meaſure underſtood it. He was between ſixteen and ſeventeen when he dy'd; and conſidering that he was a Prince of amazing Parts, and Learning above his Years; and of a manly Genius in every thing, as the

* Reformation Juſtify'd. P. 15.

Journal he wrote, which is now extant, sufficiently testifies: I leave it to all equal Judges, whether our Author be not injurious to Truth in making a *mere Child* of him. But to return to the Reformers in general: The main Body of the Clergy was equivalent to several Persons of Note; and they promoted the Reformation by embracing it: I hope there were some good Men among them. If we will believe the Bishop of *Meaux* indeed, they embrac'd it upon a vicious Principle. It will be worth While to transcribe one Paragraph upon That Subject; to give you a Sample of the Rest.

" * In the Mystery of the Holy Eucha-
" rist the Senses were flatter'd, and deliver'd
" from their Subjection to the Obedience of
" Faith. Priests were discharg'd from their
" Celibacy, Monks from their solemn Vows,
" and all in general from the Yoke of *Con-*
" *fession*: Which, tho' a wholsome Preser-
" vative against Vice, is a Burthen to Na-
" ture. A more commodious Morality was
" therefore preach'd up; which Mr. *Bur-*
" *net* says mark'd out a plain and easy Way
" to Heaven. Now such good-natur'd In-
" junctions could not but meet with an easy
" Compliance. So that of 16000 Eccleси-
" asticks, 12000, if Mr. *Burnet* may be be-

* Pref. P. 36.

" liev'd,

" liev'd, renounc'd their Celibacy in the " ſhort Reign of *Edward* VI. and all " thoſe rotten Members of the Church of " *Rome*, became *good Proteſtants* by be- " coming unfaithful to their Vows.

" 'Twas thus the Clergy was gain'd." Was it thus *only*; as the whole Diſcourſe manifeſtly tends to perſuade us? Did they change their Religion upon no other Motive? Is Monſieur *de Meaux* ſure they did not? If not; can any thing be more Unchriſtian, than to ſay they did not? They were, like the Jews upon the *Reformation* by *Chriſtianity*, deliver'd from an intolerable Yoke of Ceremonies, and outward Obſervances, (only with This Difference, Thoſe of the Jews were impos'd by God himſelf, Thoſe of the Papiſts were impos'd partly *without* any Law of God, partly contrary to one) but does it therfore follow that they acted with no View but to be ſo delivered? Nay, does it follow, that they acted with That View *at all?* Some temporal Eaſe, and Advantage to them was a Conſequence of their being Reform'd: But it is *no* Conſequence that they were Reform'd for That Reaſon. Or if they were, *partly* for That Reaſon, tho' *chiefly* for Another; That is no Argument againſt them. With regard to a good Life in general, a Man may very lawfully make the Temporal Advantages of Vertue *one* End of his being Vertuous, tho' not the

the *chief*. All this Representation of the Matter therefore by Monsieur *de Meaux* is by no means for the Honour of so great a Man. As for the Particulars he mentions, it will be sufficient to speak one Word to each of them. In the *Eucharist*, as well as every where else, it was and is fit that the *Senses* should be so far *flattered*, if We must call it by That Name, as to be allow'd competent Judges between a human Body, and a Wafer. What those Vows were which the Monks made, whether in Themselves they ought to have been broken or kept, and whether Those who made them were by sufficient Authority discharg'd from them, it is no Business of Ours to enquire: Monasteries were dissolv'd *before* the Reformation, as we have observ'd. But the Bishop is mistaken in saying that the Clergy *at* the Reformation broke their Vows of Celibacy; Because they made none, as * Bishop *Burnet* has shewn. *Confession* we have not set aside; We not only grant, but insist, that in general it is highly expedient, and in some Cases little less than necessary: Its being *absolutely necessary* to *Salvation*, and that the *Belief* of such *Necessity* is so, is all we deny concerning it. With respect to *bodily Exercise*, and Things uncommanded by God, which in truth have

* Hist. of the Reform. Part 2. P. 92.

no

no Morality in them, our Church indeed has *mark'd out a more eaſy Way to Heaven* than the *Romiſh* has done: But Popery, as I have ſhewn in another Treatiſe,† has with reſpect to Morality in general mark'd out a more eaſy Way, than Chriſtianity. We had Authority to cancel the Laws of Men, but They had None to cancel the Laws of God.

Thus then, ſays the Biſhop, *the Clergy was gain'd.* ‡ *As to the Laity, the Riches, and Revenues of the Church laid open to Rapine was become their Bait. The Plate belonging to Churches fill'd the King's Coffers* &c. This has been anſwer'd already. And what I have juſt now ſaid of the Clergy may, with due Alterations, be apply'd to many at leaſt of the Laity. The Zeal which the Biſhop ſhews for the Memory of ‡ *Becket*, That *Holy Martyr*, as He calls him, (and it is as eaſy for Us, tho' we deteſt the Murther of him, which was perpetrated by Papiſts, not Proteſtants, to give him a quite different Title) is no more an Argument for him, than our Abhorrence of his Principles, and Practices is an Argument againſt him: And in his ‖ Compariſon of *Becket* and *Cranmer*, he all along *ſuppoſes* what we ſhall never grant. I juſt obſerve, that one may not only *queſtion*, but *deny* the Miracles

† Popery truly ſtated. ‡ Pref. P. 37. ‖ Pref.. P 40, 41.

ſaid

ſaid to be wrought at That Prelate's Tomb, without *turning all Hiſtory into Scepticiſm*; as Monſieur de *Meaux*, pretty odly in my Opinion, is pleaſed to expreſs himſelf.

† *But amidſt all Theſe Reformations* (ſays He) *there was one that made no Progreſs; to wit the Reformation of Manners. I have already taken notice of the Decay of Piety which follow'd* Luther's *Reformation in* Germany. *And we need but read Mr.* Burnet's *Hiſtory to be convinc'd that the* Engliſh Reformation *produc'd the very ſame Effects.* Henry VIII. *was the firſt*, &c. And ſo proceeds with That King, and the Duke of *Somerſet*, of whom enough already; without giving any other Inſtance of the Decay of Piety upon the Reformation here in *England*: And nothing is more certain than that *true* Chriſtian Piety increas'd, not decay'd, upon the Diſcarding of Popiſh Tyranny, and *Superſtition*. And ſo it did in *Germany* too; Notwithſtanding Thoſe accidental Corruptions which follow'd the Reformation there, but were not the genuine Effects of it, as Monſieur *de Meaux* ſophiſtically ſuppoſes. It ill becomes a Papiſt to talk of the Reformation of Manners; I have * elſewhere ſhewn that in *fact*, as bad as We are, They are a great deal worſe; that

† P. 37. * Pop. truly ſtated.

Th eir

Their Religion *in*, and *of itſelf* naturally *tends* to *make* Men vicious, and that Ours as naturally tends to the Contrary.

Which puts me in mind of what I *chiefly inſiſt upon*; viz. That the Queſtion between Us and Them is, or at leaſt ought to be, of *Things* rather than of *Perſons*. Suppoſing not only ſome, but all the Reformers to have been as wicked as the Romaniſts would make them, than which, as we have ſeen, nothing can be more falſe; what would They infer from it? That therefore the Reformation is null, and void? Or the reform'd Religion vicious, and corrupt? I deny the Conſequence. A very ill Man may have lawful Authority: And a very ill Man may do a good Thing; and that too with a good Deſign: Nay tho' he does it with an ill Deſign, That does not make the Thing ceaſe to be good; in *itſelf* I mean, tho' it does as to *Him*. Farther, the worſt Actions of the worſt Men may be, and often have been, ſo turn'd and diſpos'd by the Provi- of God, as to produce Effects quite contrary to the Intention of the Agents.

But here the Biſhop of *Meaux* comes upon us with an Anſwer. † Mr. *Burnet* (ſays He) *takes a great deal of Pains to heap Examples upon Examples of vicious Princes*

† *Pref.* P. 24. 25.

whom

whom God has made use of to bring about great Designs. And who doubts it? But can he bring a single Example to prove that Almighty God intending to reveal to Men some important Truth UNKNOWN BEFORE, *has chosen so wicked a Prince as* Henry, *and so scandalous a Bishop as* Cranmer, *to be the immediate Instruments of such a Mercy? If the* English Reformation *be a divine Work, nothing is more divine in it than the King's Ecclesiastical Supremacy.* ——— *Now then it seems, forsooth, that God chose* Henry *as a proper Person to reveal this new Article of Faith to* &c. I answer 1st. Neither K. *Henry*, nor *Cranmer*, pretended to any new Revelation; nor do we in the least pretend They had any. 2dly. The *King's Supremacy* was not *unknown Before*, was no *new Article of Faith*, nor *any* Article of Faith at all: It was, and is, true; but not an Article of Faith. It was not first broach'd at the *Reformation*; but was the ancient, known, fundamental Doctrine of the *English Constitution*. So there was no need of a new Revelation in its favour. 3dly. What does the Bishop mean by a *divine Work*? A Work brought about by the Assistance of immediate Inspiration? We do not say the Reformation was a divine Work in That Sense. Or a Work relating to divine Things, and effected by the extraordinary Providence of God? In That Sense the Reformation

formation *was* a divine Work. This Diſtinction is very true, and material; tho' the Biſhop's Arguing from either Senſe of the Words is ſtrangely ſingular. *If the* Engliſh *Reformation be a divine Work; nothing can be more divine in it than the King's Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy; ſince it not only was the firſt Cauſe of a Separation from the Church of* Rome, *which, as Proteſtants generally Maintain, is a neceſſary Condition with which every good and ſolid Reformation ought to begin*, &c. That is, If This be a beautiful *Houſe*; nothing can be more beautiful in it than the *Foundation*: If That be an excellent *Diſcourſe*; nothing can be more excellent in it, than the *firſt Sentence*: Not to inſiſt upon his confounding the *Doctrine* itſelf with the *Maintaining* and *Aſſerting* of That Doctrine. Beſides; the Reformation (meaning here the reform'd Religion, for of That he ſpeaks, tho' he does not ſpeak clearly) may be a divine Work even in the higheſt Senſe, and yet every thing in it not be divine. I hope it will be allow'd that St. *Paul's* Epiſtles are divinely inſpir'd; and yet every thing in them is not ſo, as He himſelf aſſures us. The reform'd Religion therefore may be divine; notwithſtanding which, the King's Supremacy, deſtructive of the Pope's, may be one of it's Doctrines, and a very true one too, and yet not be divine. Nay the *Aſſerting* of That Doctrine might *occaſion* the *Reformation* in *Religion*;

and

and yet That Doctrine be a very little Part of the *Religion* so *reform'd*, or no Part of it at all. When he says *Protestants maintain that Separation from the Church of* Rome *is a necessary Condition, with which every good and solid Reformation ought to begin*; He puts a Piece of false Doctrine, and Nonsense upon us, of which we are wholly innocent. Churches may want to be reform'd, and many actually do, which were never in Subjection to the See of *Rome*; and other Corruptions ought to be reform'd besides Those of Popery. Even They who wisely and discreetly throw off the Popish Corruptions separate from the Church of *Rome* only *in* her Corruptions, or (if you would have it in other Words) only *as* she is corrupt, not as she is the Church of *Rome*: And such a Separation, if those Churches had no Corruptions but Popish ones, is not only the *Beginning* of a *true and solid Reformation*; but the *Beginning*, *Middle*, and *End* of it too. Let it be observ'd here, as always upon This Subject, that when Communion is broken off between two Churches upon the Score of real Corruptions in one of them; That corrupt Church, not the other, is properly the Separatist.

But the Bishop of *Meaux* says, This Point [the King's Supremacy] * *is to this Day the only Point in which* Protestants *never vary'd since the Beginning of the Schism*:

* Ibid.

And

And from thence likewiſe infers, that *if the Reformation be a divine Work; This Point is as divine as any thing in it.* The Argument then, upon Suppoſition that the Reformation is a divine Work, ſtands Thus. Whatſoever is the only Point in which Proteſtants never vary'd, is *as* divine as any thing in the Reformation; [*more* ſo, one would think, if there be any thing at all in the Argument;] But the King's Supremacy is the only Point in which Proteſtants never vary'd: Therefore the King's Supremacy is as divine as any thing in the Reformation. I deny both Propoſitions: The *Major* is falſe in *Reaſon*; and the *Minor* in *Fact*. The Former proceeds upon This erroneous Principle, that a Doctrine's being more, or leſs vary'd, makes it more, or leſs divine; at leaſt that it's being divine has a dependance upon it's being unvary'd. Whereas a certain Point in a Syſtem (which is Divine in the groſs) may be unvary'd, undiſputed, without being divine at all; and the others contain'd in it may be vary'd, or diſputed, and be divine notwithſtanding. The Latter is a moſt notorious Untruth in Fact: For have Proteſtants maintain'd no Doctrine without Variation, but That of the King's Supremacy? How have they vary'd in the Rejection of Infallibility, the Condemnation of Image-Worſhip, Invocation of Saints, Indulgencies, and

and Prayers in an unknown Tongue? How have they vary'd in aſſerting that Scripture is the only Rule of Faith, that Contrition is neceſſary to Salvation, *&c?* By the way, the Biſhop takes it for granted that they all agree in the King's Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy; Which *cannot* be true of Proteſtant Countries that have not Kings; nor *is* it true of all that have. What he ſays about God's Judgments upon *Henry* VIII. is nothing to the Merits of our Cauſe: He was an ill Man no doubt; and we are now arguing upon a Suppoſition, tho' a falſe one, that all the Reformers were ſo; tho' That Prince was not one of them. Of This Paſſage therefore I only obſerve, that as it is not pertinent to our Subject, ſo I am afraid it is not very good Senſe in itſelf. I know of but one Sort of *God's Judgments* by which Men can be made * an *Example*: And That is the Infliction of ſome *ſignal, diſtinguiſhing* Puniſhment; not their being barely † *deliver'd up to their own Paſſions, and the Flatteries of Thoſe that are about them*; which is not ſo much, if at all, *taken notice of* by the World.

The Queſtion then is not, whether the Reformers were good Men; but whether the Reform'd Religion be a good Religion.

---

* Ibid. † P. 303.

Our

Our Author Himſelf, after having been at the Expence of ſo many Sections in this Third Dialogue, upon perſonal Scandal, forgets himſelf in the Fourth, knocks it all on the Head, and gives up the whole Topick.

G. * *But pray, Sir, may not a good Cauſe be undertaken, and forwarded upon bad Motives? If ſo; as it cannot be queſtion'd but it may; why may not the Reformation be perfectly good and juſtifiable in it ſelf, tho' it was ſet on foot, and manag'd by Perſons of corrupt Morals, and upon intereſted Views?*

P. *Sir, I don't pretend that eſpouſing a Cauſe upon intereſted or wicked Motives either ſuppoſes it to be bad, or renders it ſo. Becauſe the very beſt Cauſe may poſſibly be eſpouſed with the moſt corrupt Intentions, and by Perſons void in reality of all Senſe of Religion. But I think we ought to be very circumſpect, and wary in truſting ſuch corrupt and mercenary Wretches in matters of Religion; let them profeſs as much Zeal for it as they pleaſe.*

So, We have it at laſt; He has been talking impertinently all this while, according to his own Account. Not ſo, he will ſay; *We muſt be very circumſpect, and wary in truſting ſuch Wretches.* Is That all? Has

---

* P. 303.

so much Pains been taken for no more? Tho' he could not forbear throwing the Dirt; hoping it would stick, notwithstanding This Concession, which the *unwary* Reader very likely might not observe: Yet Prudence in providing for a Retreat, or, it may be, the irresistible Force of Truth, oblig'd him to make This Acknowledgement. He could not therefore avoid taking notice of the Objection: But what an Answer has he given to it? We must be very *wary*, and *circumspect*; So we are, and He knows it: *More* wary than they desire we should be. To TRUST *any* Persons whatsoever, not only such Wretches as those of whom he speaks, without *examining* their Proceedings and Pretensions, by Reason and Scripture, is *Their* Way, not *Ours*. So all this Scandal has been rak'd together, merely for the sake of Scandal; and that according to his own extorted, tho' *unwary*, Confession.

That from the Corruption of the Reformers then, supposing them to have been all very wicked, cannot be truly inferr'd the Corruption of the Reformation, appears from what been discours'd; or rather is evident of itself. What then? Is the Consideration of *Persons* to be wholly set aside in Cases of This nature? Not so neither. If the *Things* be doubtful, and difficult; the Characters of Persons ought to have some Weight. But when

when the Firſt are plain, and ſelf-evident; the Laſt are to be diſregarded. Now the Corruptions of Popery were ſo flagrant; that it was neceſſary to caſhier them, whatever were the Perſonal Characters, and Views of Thoſe by whom they were to be caſhier'd. Admitting therefore *Henry* VIII. to have been a Reformer; to his objected Morals I oppoſe the inſufferable Uſurpation, and Tyranny of the *Pope*. Againſt *Cranmer*, (ſuppoſing him to have been as bad, as they would make him, tho' nothing can be more falſe) I ſet Image-Worſhip, Communion in one Kind, with about a Dozen more: And Tranſubſtantiation will at any time be a Match for the Duke of *Somerſet*. Purgatory, the Doctrine of Merit, Indulgencies, and the Deſtruction of all Morality and common Honeſty by *Opus Operatum*, will at leaſt be a Ballance to the profligate Principles and Practice of Queen *Elizabeth*, and her Miniſtry; (I ſpeak in the Language of a Papiſt) And the FACT of the Death, call it *Murther*, if you will, of *Mary* Queen of *Scots*, was not near ſo great a Blemiſh upon That Proteſtant REIGN, as the DOCTRINE of Depoſing and Murthering Princes is upon the Popiſh RELIGION. The Argument of our Adverſaries therefore from the at preſent ſuppoſed Wickedneſs of the Reformers would be much ſtronger than it is, were That the *only* Conſideration. But it

happens to be quite otherwiſe. Beſides; Were all This Arguing from Facts to Doctrines, from Perſons to Things, really concluſive; it may be *retorted* upon the Romaniſts, and holds full as ſtrongly againſt Them, as againſt Us. To paſs over That Monſter *Phocas*, who firſt encouraged the Pope's Supremacy; as alſo the flagitious Lives of very many Popes themſelves; let us confine our Remarks to the Times of which we are ſpeaking, when the Struggle was made about the *Engliſh* Reformation. Queen *Mary* promiſed the *Norfolk* and *Suffolk* Men, and her Council, that ſhe would make no Alteration in Religion. Did She mean that She would continue the Reformation, as it was in her Brother's Reign? If ſo; She broke her ſolemn Royal Promiſe, in a Thing of the moſt important and ſacred Nature. Did She mean that She would reſtore Popery? If ſo; She equivocated, and was guilty of infamous Prevarication in the ſame momentous and ſacred Affair. Then was the barbarous Cruelty of Herſelf, or her Miniſters, or Both, no Fault? Do the Fires of *Smithfield*, and *Baliol*, and many other Places, caſt no Slur upon That Reign? With what Front can a Papiſt, as This Author does, talk of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Cruelty; who only conſiders that She had an elder Siſter? But of this we ſhall have Occaſion to ſpeak more in another Place. Did not *Gardiner* promote

promote and ſubſcribe K. *Henry*'s Divorce, aſſert *his* Supremacy, and diſclaim the Pope's, as well as *Cranmer*? and prevaricate in *Edward* the Sixth's Time, as the Other did in *Henry* the Eighth's? And cannot the ſame, and more, be ſaid of *Bonner*? Concerning which Latter it may be added that he is ſaid to have favour'd the *Lutherans* in *Henry* VIII's Reign; tho' he was ſo cruel a Perſecutor in Queen *Mary*'s.

To ſumm up the whole Evidence under This Head. 1ſt. All thoſe whom our Adverſaries call Reformers were not ſo. 2dly. The worſt Things done in thoſe Times which They object againſt, were done by Papiſts, not by Proteſtants. 3dly. Some of the Reformers might indeed be bad Men. Tho' 4thly. They were not ſo bad as our Adverſaries repreſent them. 5thly. Many of them were excellently good Men. 6thly. Suppoſe all This were quite otherwiſe, and all the Facts were exactly ſuch, as the Papiſts have deliver'd them to us; yet the Conſequence is utterly falſe: The Reformers might be all vicious; and yet the Reform'd Religion may be pure and holy. And we have prov'd from Reaſon, and Scripture, that it is ſo. 7. Laſtly, the Argument may be retorted upon our Adverſaries; and proves as ſtrongly againſt Them as againſt Us.

The next Objection is about the *Means* by which the Reformation was effected. To which I answer, 1st. That tho' a good End does not excuse, much less sanctify, bad Means (to say it does, is Popish, not Protestant Doctrine) yet a good End may be brought about by bad Means; and the Badness of the Last-mention'd destroys not the Goodness of the Other; I mean as to the Thing itself, tho' it does as to the Agent. But 2dly. We will consider the Facts alledg'd. And the first is *Force* and *Compulsion*. By what our Auther says upon This, one would think the Reformation was carry'd on with Fire, and Sword: A more frightful Outcry could not well be made against *Nero*, or *Diocleſian*. Whereas, in truth, there was no Force us'd by our Protestant Reformers, but what was necessary to guard the Laws of the Land; No Papist was burnt for Religion in *Edward* VI. and Queen *Elizabeth*'s Time, as Many Protestants were in Q. *Mary*'s. With what face can Papists say, as some do, that *She* put People to Death only for Political Crimes, not upon the Score of Religion? This is true of K. *Edward* VI. and Q. *Elizabeth*; but most false of Q. *Mary*. But no Wonder that Those who *deny* the *Powder-Plot*, should *affirm* This; or indeed affirm, or deny, any thing else. Let the Reader upon This Article look into Primate *Bramhall's Just Vindication*, P. 65, 66.

And

And This leads me to our Author's curious Reaſoning upon the Statute whereby, as * He affirms, *ſaying Maſs is made High Treaſon, and being preſent at it Felony.* No doubt ‡ *penal Laws can never change the Nature, or Eſſence of Things*, in Morality, and Divinity. Murder, for example, is as much Murder, without ſuch a Law as with it; nor can any Law turn Virtue into Vice, or one Virtue, or Vice into another. This is true, but not to the Purpoſe. For 1ſt. Treaſon, properly and ſtrictly ſpeaking, is a *Political Crime*. "High Treaſon † "(ſays the Law of *England*) is an Offence "committed againſt the Security of the "King or Kingdom." If it be conſidered as a *Sin*, or an Offence againſt the Law of God; it is call'd Undutifulneſs, Reſiſtance, or Diſobedience to the Higher Powers, Rebellion, *&c.* not Treaſon. Treaſon is a Law Term; not an Ethical, or Theological one. 2dly. Human Laws *may* change the Nature of Crimes in a Civil tho' not in a Theological Senſe. Murder itſelf is one Thing in Divinity, and another in Law: And the Law may make That to be Murder, politically ſpeaking, which was not ſo before. For Inſtance, What is now barely Manſlaughter may be made Murder; and perhaps in ſome Caſes,

---

* P. 270, to 273. ‡ P. 270. † *Wood's* Inſtitut P. 587.

it

it would not be amiss, if it were. 3dly. The Laws, after all, *making* (as 'tis call'd) This, or That, High Treason, *may not* change the specific Nature of the Thing, but only add a Penalty to it. The Words in such Acts of Parliament, are, *shall be taken, deem'd, adjudg'd to be* High Treason; which *may* mean no more *than treated as if it were* so: And more plainly, The *Persons Convict shall suffer Pains* &c. *as in Cases of High Treason.* But This I do not insist upon: I stand to what I said Before, That Human Laws may change the Nature of Crimes in a Civil, tho' not a in Theological, Sense. And this shews the Inconsequence of our Author's Arguing. **Hence it follows,* says He, *that if Q.* Elizabeth's *Law was just, saying Mass both is, and has always been, a* SIN *of as black a Dye in* THE SIGHT OF GOD, *as High Treason.* That it is so may be true, for any thing he has said to the Contrary; But however, the Consequence is not true. It may not be so black in the Sight of God, and yet be so pernicious, Politically speaking, as to be fitly and justly punish'd as High Treason, after Human Laws have enacted and declar'd that it *shall* be so. What † He here offers in Justification of saying Mass, in Point of

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

Religion,

Religion, from the Example of St. *Gregory*, and Others, has been elſewhere ſufficiently conſider'd; and is nothing to the preſent Purpoſe. I ſhould not have been ſo particular upon This; but that our Author raiſes ſuch Tragedies about it. *And therefore*, ſays He, ‡ *I cannot but regard that Sanguinary Statute of Q.* Elizabeth, *which, during her long Reign, was executed with the utmoſt Violence, and Rigor, as one of the blackeſt Stains in her Character.* That it was executed with the utmoſt Violence, and Rigour, is utterly untrue: If ever there was ſuch a Statute at all; As it is pretty plain to Me, there never was. But That is a *Circumſtance*, which we wave at preſent. The next Words are Theſe.

‖ *But, Sir, Proteſtants will ſay, that Q.* Elizabeth *regarded the Doctrine of the Maſs as an execrable Hereſy. And when ſhe made Laws againſt it, and executed thoſe Laws, She only follow'd the Examples of her Father* Henry, *and Siſter* Mary; *who had put ſeveral Perſons to Death, upon the Score of Hereſy.* Before the Preceptor ſpeaks, let me put in one Word by way of Anſwer to the young Gentleman. Q. *Elizabeth* might, and that very juſtly, regard the Do-

‡ P. 171. ‖ Ibid.

ctrine of the Mass as an execrable Heresy; but that She *therefore* made Sanguinary Laws against it, following the Example of *&c.* No Protestant will say. We abhor the thoughts of putting any Person to Death for Heresy. But now, begging Pardon for this Interruption, let us hear the Preceptor. * *Sir, It cannot be questioned but that Heresy is not only a most grievous Sin, but many times of pernicious Consequence to the State; and may therefore in certain Circumstances be justly punish'd with Death.* I am glad he puts it upon That Foot: Their *Laws* about *burning Hereticks*, make Heresy *as* Heresy punishable with Death. † *But whether both* Henry *and* Mary *had always a due regard to Those Circumstances, I will not undertake to determine.* One may without any Presumption undertake to determine, that they regarded Those whom they call'd Hereticks *as* Hereticks, and punish'd them with Death for being such: And in so proceeding they acted according to the Principles of their Religion. ‡ *This however I am sure of, That their Case was very different from that of Q.* Elizabeth." It was indeed: and I have above taken notice *how* it was. || *Because they only punish'd Heresy which had been con-*

---

* *Ibid* † P. 272. ‡ *Ibid.* || *Ibid.*

demn'd

demn'd many Ages before by the Univerſal Church. No ſuch matter: And I have fully ſhewn the Falſhood of This confident Aſſertion. * *Whereas if Q.* Elizabeth *thought fit* (*as ſupreme Head of the Church*) *to regard the Doctrine of the Maſs as a Hereſy; it was a Hereſy form'd in her own Imagination, never thought, nor heard of, at leaſt before the Reformation, in any Chriſtian Nation under the Sun.* I anſwer, 1ſt. Q. *Elizabeth* alone neither did, nor could, make This, or any other Statute: She made it, if it was made at all, in Conjunction with her two Houſes of Parliament. 2dly. She did not act in That matter, as ſupreme Head of the Church, but in her Civil Capacity. 3dly, She and her Parliament did not *Here* regard the *Doctrine* of *the Maſs* as *Hereſy*; but the *Saying* and *Hearing* of *Maſs* as prejudicial and pernicious to the Kingdom. 4thly. If They did regard the Doctrine of it as Hereſy, They were in the Right; as it were eaſy to Shew. Therefore, 5thly. *It was not a Hereſy form'd in Q.* Elizabeth's *own Imagination.* 6thly. This Hereſy was indeed *never thought, nor heard of*, for the firſt 800 Years after Chriſt; becauſe in That Time there was no ſuch thing at all. 7thly. It might not be heard

* *Ibid.*

of

of as a *Heresy*, before the Reformation; and yet *be* one from its Birth. * *Nay She herself at her first Coming to the Crown, order'd a solemn Mass to be said for the Soul of her Sister* Mary, *and another for* Charles V. * Where did he pick up This History? I never heard of it Before. Why does he not quote his Author? The Reason is plain; 'Tis a Piece of Popish *secret History*, and there is no Truth in it. Or if it were true; it would be nothing to the Purpose. † *But after all, Sir, the Priests that suffer'd in her Reign did not suffer for Heresy, but for Treason.* Very well; And all Papists that suffer'd in her Reign, suffer'd for Political Crimes, not for Religion; as Protestants did in Q. *Mary*'s. After all; what single Priest *did* suffer, as a Traytor, in Q. *Elizabeth*'s Reign, for saying Mass; or what single Person as a Felon, for being present at it? After all too, what Statute is This, of which our Author speaks? When was it made? and how is it worded? Why there is no such Statute in Being; nor ever was; as I can perceive. I suppose he means (for there is no other Statute now subsisting that comes near such a one as He imagines) That of 5 *Eliz. Ch.* 1. But 1st. Here is nothing about *Felony* for *being* at Mass. And 2dly. as to the *Treason*, 'tis not *saying Mass* that is made so: But it is

* Ibid. † Ibid.

enacted

enacted that whoever ſhall ſay, or hear private Maſs, and refuſe the Oaths of Supremacy, *&c.* after they are twice tender'd, ſhall be guilty of Treaſon. 'Tis therefore refuſing the Oaths in Them who ſhall ſay, or hear Maſs, not ſaying, or hearing it, which is made Treaſon. And all Perſons who have any Cure or Preferment in the Church, or Office in an Eccleſiaſtical Court, are upon the like Refuſal involv'd in the ſame Crime. If there ever was ſuch a Law, as he ſpeaks of, it is now repeal'd; which I hope may be ſome Anſwer to This terrible Objection.

To our Author's poſitive Aſſertion, * that it was not *ſo much as pretended* that the Prieſts, who thus *ſuffer'd*, were *guilty* of *any Endeavours to ſubvert the Government*, or of any *treaſonable Practiſes*, except That of ſaying Maſs; I anſwer 1ſt. Whatever is to be ſaid of *Them* in particular, if there were any ſuch; it is pretty plain from the Preamble to 27 *Eliz.* Cap. 2. That ſome Popiſh Prieſts were pretended at leaſt to be guilty of ſuch Practiſes in That Reign. "Whereas divers Perſons call'd or profeſs'd "Jeſuits, Seminary Prieſts, and other Prieſts "——have of late Years come, and been "ſent, and daily do come, and are ſent in-"to this Realm of *England*, and other

* Ibid.

"the

" the Queen's Majeſty's Dominions, of " Purpoſe (as it hath appear'd as well by ſun- " dry of their own Examinations, and Con- " feſſions, as divers other manifeſt Means, and " Proofs) not only to Withdraw her High- " neſs's Subjects from their due Obedience " to her Majeſty, but alſo to ſtir up and " move Sedition, Rebellion, and open " Hoſtility within the ſame her Highneſs's " Realms and Dominions, to the great " endangering of the Safety of her moſt " Royal Perſon, and to the utter Ruin and " Deſolation of the whole Realm, if the ſame " be not the ſooner by ſome good Means " foreſeen, and prevented: Be it enacted " *&c.*" I anſwer 2dly. By asking this Writer; are not the Laws in Popiſh Countries full as ſevere againſt Prieſts of the Church of *England*, as Ours are againſt Thoſe of the Church of *Rome?* and at leaſt as ſeverely and rigorouſly executed?

To the Force, and Violence us'd at the Reformation, they reduce the * Deprivation of Biſhops, and ſome of the Inferior Clergy, who would not comply with it. But is This ſo great a Hardſhip? Such mighty Force and Violence? Is it fitting, or agreeable to Common Senſe, that a Pro-

* 240, 254. and elſewhere.

teſtant

teſtant Government ſhould ſuffer a Popiſh Prelacy and Clergy? Would any Popiſh Government ſuffer Biſhopricks, or other Eccleſiaſtical Preferments, to be held by Proteſtants? If they ſay the Deprivation was illegal, and made by an incompetent Authority: I reply, 1ſt. by referring to Dr. *Hammond*, whoſe Words upon this Subject I ſhall have occaſion to cite hereafter. 2dly. By asking, whether it be not known to all the World that Biſhops were depriv'd by the Regal Authority only, in Q. *Mary's* Reign, as well as in Q. *Elizabeth's*?

And This brings us to their grand Objection of all, concerning the *Uſurpations*, and *Encroachments* of the *State* upon the *Church*. And here is a heavy Accuſation indeed. If we will take Things as * This Author and the Biſhop of *Meaux* repreſent them; the Clergy, at the Reformation, gave up the Power of the Keys, and all Authority purely Spiritual, into the Hands of the Laity: The Biſhops were totally enſlav'd by the Court, and abſolutely quitted to the Crown all the Commiſſion they had receiv'd from Chriſt: It was, and is, the Doctrine of the Reform'd Church of *England*, that all Eccleſiaſtical Powers are deriv'd from the Civil, and the Church is a mere Creature

* Pref. and 3d. Dial. *paſſim*.

of

of the State: The Reformation was made entirely, or very near entirely, by the Laity; and the Clergy had no Hand, or next to none, in That great Change. This, I say, is a dreadful Outcry; but 'tis without Truth, or Reason.

The *King's Supremacy* over the Church is *exclaim'd* against as a *Monster* unheard of Before; as a Thing to the last degree absurd, and impious. To which I answer, 1st. King *Henry* VIII. who, as They say, first *assum'd* This Supremacy, and Those who yeilded it to him, both Laity, and Clergy, were Papists. 2dly, Such a Supremacy as We maintain, whatever King *Henry* meant, is agreeable to Reason, and Scripture, and to the constant Practise of God's Church, both Jewish, and Christian. Here in *England* particularly, the King's Supremacy in Ecclesiastical Causes was held fundamental to our Constitution many hundred Years before the Reformation; nay, from the Beginning: As it has been very largely and fully prov'd, by many learned Men, the great Primate *Bramhall* particularly. And therefore when our Author affirms * that King *Henry* VIII. was *made Supreme Head of the Church by the Parliament*, he is doubly mistaken; He was not MADE

* Pref. P. 16.

so,

ſo, but DECLAR'D ſo; and not by the *Parliament* only, but by the Clergy in Convocation alſo: Of which latter more in another place. That there ſhould be ſuch a Supremacy as We contend for, is neceſſary to the Well-being at leaſt of Civil Government, if not the very Being of it. There would otherwiſe be really *Imperium in Imperio*, or rather the greateſt Danger of *Imperium contra Imperium*, in the ſame Nation. If the Sovereign Prince had not a Right to take Cognizance of all Cauſes, Eccleſiaſtical, as well as Civil, and *ſome* Authority over them; He would be but a Piece of a King in his own Dominions, and his Government would be manifeſtly precarious. The Church by Vertue of Thoſe Words *in ordine ad Spiritualia*, might (as Pôpes have actually done) exerciſe temporal Authority, and deſtroy the Regal Power. Such a Supremacy therefore is "a Right due to all Chriſtian Princes "by the Laws of God and Nature;" as Primate *Bramhall* ſpeaks *.

I ſay, *ſuch* a Supremacy as *We* contend for. If then we are ask'd, *what* Supremacy? I own, the right Queſtion is, *what* is the Prince's Power over the Church, and *how far* does it extend? Our Adverſaries

* Schiſm guarded P. 360.

will have it that we mean This, or That by it; whether *We* will, no. They take notice of our Explanations, but will not admit of them; that is, they will not suffer us to understand our own Meaning, but are resolv'd to understand it better than we Ourselves. I say but little of This Matter, as it stood in the Reigns of *Henry* VIII. and *Edward* VI. because all that is incumbent upon Us Now, is to justify the Reformation as it Now is. This we may be allow'd to plead, upon our Author's own Concession. † *Thus then*, says He, speaking of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, *was laid the Foundation of the Reform'd* English *Church, as it Now stands. For all former Acts relating to the Supremacy having been repeal'd in Q.* Mary's *Reign; the Reformation began entirely upon a new Footing in the Year* 1558, *which was the first of Queen* Elizabeth's *Reign. And tho' it commonly takes it's Date from the Year wherein King* Henry *assum'd the Spiritual Supremacy, and thereby open'd the way to the several Reformations that follow'd; yet* TO SPEAK PROPERLY, *the Reform'd Church of* England, *as to it's present Establishment, and Constitution, can trace it's Original no higher, than the Year* 1558; *when it's Founda-*

† P. 251.

tion

tion was firſt laid upon Queen Elizabeth's *Spiritual Supremacy, as it's chief Groundwork.* Tho' ſomething may be here liable to juſt Exception, as to the Date of the Reformation, with reſpect to many Points; yet taking the Whole as our Author gives it us, it follows that to charge the *preſent* Reformation with Faults, either as to Things, or Perſons, or Both, upon the Account of what was done before That time he ſpeaks of, is to *ſpeak improperly*: And therefore, had it not been for the ſake of Scandal, a very great Part of his *boaſted* Performance might have been ſpared. I ſhall, notwithſtanding, both here, and hereafter, as Occaſion offers, make a few curſory Obſervations upon what is objected, even as relating to thoſe two former Reigns: Tho' it is *ex abundanti*, and more than I am oblig'd to.

He aſſerts † that *the Act of Supremacy beſtowed upon King* Henry VIII. *That ſame Supreme Spiritual Juriſdiction and Authority of which they had diſpoſſeſs'd the Pope: And That differs as much from the Temporal Juriſdiction and Authority of Kings, as the Regal and Epiſcopal Characters differ from one another.* I anſwer, 1ſt, The Thing itſelf is not true: There are no ſuch Words in the Act, which he juſt before recites, as

† P. 189.

the supreme Spiritual Jurisdiction of which the Pope was dispossessed: Nor can such a Power be inferr'd from the Words of That, or any other Act, join'd with the Practice which explains them. 2dly, He supposes that the Pope, in vertue of his Supremacy, acted as a *Bishop*; Which is most false: He acted as a *Monarch*; a Monarch not only in Spirituals, but in Temporals; and That too not only in his own Dominions, but in Those of other Princes. But let us consider the spiritual Part only: How comes This Writer to give the Pope no more than an Episcopal Character? Did He claim no more? Or if he did; does the Episcopal Character import a supreme spiritual Monarchy over all Bishops? And did not Popes pretend to such a Monarchy? What I further observe upon This Head, shall be apply'd as an Answer to the Bishop of *Meaux*'s Assertions. " † To prepare the " Way, says He, for their intended Reformation in the King's Name (*Edward* the " Sixth's) He was immediately declared, as " his Father had been before him, supreme " Head in Spirituals, as well as Temporals, " of the Church of *England*. For from " the Time that *Henry* took upon him the " Spiritual Supremacy, it became a Maxim, " that the King was Pope in *England*. But " greater Prerogatives were bestow'd upon

† Pref. P. 31.

This

" This new Pope, than the Popes of *Rome* " had ever claim'd. For the Biſhops were " oblig'd to receive new Commiſſions from " King *Edward* revocable at Pleaſure; as " King *Henry* had before, *&c.*" Notwithſtanding the Caſe of the Commiſſions revocable at Pleaſure (which is the worſt they can ſay, and which I confeſs is bad enough) it is untruly aſſerted that greater Prerogatives were given to the King than were ever claim'd by the Pope. Not greater; nor near ſo great. For the Popes claim'd a *plenitude of Power* to do *what they pleas'd* with all Biſhops, and indeed with every Body elſe, both in Spirituals, and Temporals. And accordingly they ſet up, and pull'd down, put in, and turn'd out, whom they lik'd, or diſlik'd: For not only the Power of the Biſhops to exerciſe their Functions, but their Biſhopricks, and their very Orders, were *revocable at pleaſure.*

The repeated Clamours of our Author, and Monſieur *de M.* againſt the Spiritual Powers ſuppos'd to be uſurp'd by the Crown, and yielded by the Clergy, in Thoſe Reigns, will of courſe, be anſwered, when we come to Queen *Elizabeth's* (upon which, for the above-mention'd Reaſon, we ſhall chiefly inſiſt) becauſe That will neceſſarily have a Retroſpect to the other Two. Here I only ask: Do our Adverſaries *really*, and in *carneſt* inſiſt, that according to Us all

Manner of Spiritual Power and Authority is originally in the Crown, and deriv'd from it to the Biſhops and Clergy; or do they Not? If they do Not; why do This Author and the Biſhop of *Meaux* talk as if they did; and That ſo very often, and in as plain Words as can be Utter'd? If they do ſo inſiſt; was there ever any thing more falſe and abſurd, than ſuch an Aſſertion? Do they not in their own Conſciences know it to be falſe? And do they not ſhamefully contradict themſelves by owning that even *Henry* VIII. had not Power given him to preach, and adminiſter the Sacraments? For ſo This * Writer acknowledges expreſly; and the Biſhop of *Meaux*, and all Mankind, muſt acknowledge the ſame. Is it not evident even to Them, that whatever be meant by ſome ſtrange Expreſſions in Acts of Parliament, Commiſſions, *&c.* That *cannot* be the Meaning of them which Theſe Writers pretend; or at leaſt that it is not our Meaning Now, and was not in Q. *Elizabeth's* Days? But our Author, as I ſaid, will not ſuffer us to know our own Meaning, and to explain it our own Way. *I inſiſt ſo particularly upon This*, ſays He, † *becauſe when the Act of Supremacy, which was repeal'd in Q.* Mary's *Reign, was again renewed in favour of Q.* Elizabeth, *and*

* *P.* 190. † *P.* 189.

great

great Numbers appear'd ſcandaliz'd —— that a Woman ſhould be declar'd Supreme Head, &c. *to cover the Scandal of it, the Compoſers of the 39 Articles were oblig'd to gloſs it over with this ſtrain'd Interpretation, that the Act meant no more than to give that Prerogative to the Queen which had been given to all godly Princes*, &c. Art. 37. *But who ſees not that This was but a Gilding of the Pill*, &c? *But more of this hereafter.* Hereafter then we ſhall meet with it; and ſhall not in the leaſt be afraid of it. At preſent I obſerve, 1ſt. That Q. *Mary* did not lay aſide the Title of Head of the Church, till the Third Parliament of her Reign; with Reluctancy did it even Then; and very likely had not done it at all, but that it was neceſſary, in order to her Legitimation, to reſtore the Pope's Supremacy, with which her own over the Church was inconſiſtent. * If this Title *Head of the Church*, was ſo abſurd and wicked, as apply'd to a Woman; what ſhall we ſay of their Favourite Q. *Mary*, who for ſo long a time uſurp'd it? 2dly. The Article was not contriv'd to gloſs over the Scandal of a Woman's being declar'd Head of the Church; For Q. *Elizabeth*, who never lik'd That Title, laid it aſide before the Articles were compos'd.

* See Dr. *Hammond*'s Works Vol. I. *P.* 525.

† G. But may we not take the Oath of Supremacy with This Interpretation tack'd to it?

P. "I ſhould be loath to do it. And my "Reaſon is, becauſe Oaths are ſacred Things, "and not to be trifled with; Nor can any "Man warrant me to ſwear one thing and "mean another. As I cannot, for example, "ſwear that the King of Great *Britain* is "the Czar of *Muſcovy*; tho' he that ſhould "tender this Oath ſhould aſſure me that "nothing more was meant by it than that "the King of Great *Britain* is the *Supreme* "*Head* and *Governor* in his own Dominions, as the Czar of *Muſcovy* is in his. "Becauſe Tho' this Interpretation imports "a real Truth, it differs wholly from the "obvious Meaning of the Words of the "Oath." Oaths are certainly ſacred Things; ſo ſacred, that I cannot reconcile the Popiſh Doctrine of Equivocation and mental Reſervation with their Sacredneſs. But is this Propoſition, *The King of Great* Britain *is in his own Dominions Supreme over all Perſons, in all Cauſes, Eccleſiaſtical, and Civil,* as manifeſtly falſe as This, *The King of Great* Britain *is the Czar of* Muſcovy? And are Theſe Words, *We do not mean that the King of Great* Britain *has Authority to preach, and adminiſter the Sacraments, but only that he has the ſame Prerogative which*

† P. 189.

has

has been given to all godly Princes, to rule all Eſtates and Degrees, &c. as different from the obvious Senſe of the Former; as Theſe, *nothing more is meant by it than that the King of Great* Britain *is the Supreme Head and Governour in his own Dominions, as the Czar of* Muſcovy *is in His*, manifeſtly are from the obvious Senſe of the Latter? Anybody, that has Eyes, may ſee the Contrary.

* *In the firſt Place*, continues He, *it made him Supreme Judge in all Controverſies of Religion*, &c. And ſo proceeds, diſplaying under three diſtinct Heads the Plenitude of Spiritual Power aſcrib'd to K. *Henry* by the Act of Supremacy. To all which I have given a general Anſwer already; and reſerve a more particular one for a more proper Place. His affirming that † the *Parliament* acted *with juſt as much Freedom as a Man delivers his Purſe when he has a Piſtol preſented to his Breaſt*, is a little odd. That the *Clergy* were in ſome Meaſure influenc'd by Fear, I grant; and ſhall ſpeak to That Objection hereafter. But that the *Parliament's Voting was extorted by Fear*, is not ſo plain: I never heard of any *Premunire* They had incurr'd.

‡ His next Words are, *I ſhould be glad to know from which of the Apoſtles King* Henry *deſcended*. Really, I cannot inform

* P. 190, 191. † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

him

him: Neither am I ſenſible that King *Henry* ever imagin'd himſelf deſcended from any. By This Man's way of Talking, one would think That Prince took upon him to confer Orders, to excommunicate, and abſolve; preach'd at leaſt once a Month to exerciſe his Faculty; and adminiſter'd all the *ſeven* Sacraments at leaſt once a Year, to ſhew that he inſiſted upon every Branch of his Authority. He goes on in the ſame ſtrain to the End of the Paragraph: And to all of it I anſwer; that *Henry* VIII. did not dream of governing the Church as a *Clergyman*, but as a *King*.

Which brings us back to our Main Point, the *Nature*, and *Extent*, of the *Regal Supremacy* in *Eccleſiaſtical* Affairs; according to the *true Senſe* and Meaning of *our Church*, and *State* too, upon That Head. This will be beſt clear'd by our conſidering the Explication of it in Q. *Elizabeth*'s time before hinted at, and now to be more fully diſcuſs'd. Our Author, ſpeaking of the 37th. Article, tells us, ‖ 1ſt. *That the precarious Interpretation of a few private Perſons cannot invalidate the Force of a ſolemn Act of Parliament, with the Royal Sanction to it.* I anſwer, 1ſt. All the Biſhops, and the whole Repreſentative Body of the Clergy in Convocation, can with no

‖ P. 248.

tolerable

tolerable Propriety be call'd a few private Perſons. Not *a few*; becauſe there are in both Provinces, above 200 of them. Not *private Perſons*; becauſe they are aſſembled in a Parliamentary Way, and act in a publick legiſlative Capacity. 2dly. The Parliament then in Being acquieſc'd in This Interpretation; and ſo did the Queen, for whoſe Uſe the Act was made. 3dly. A ſubſequent Parliament confirm'd, and eſtabliſh'd This Interpretation by * confirming and eſtabliſhing the 39 Articles.

He ſays, 2dly *That the Interpretation contain'd in the 37th Article, if meant of the Queen's Supremacy over the Clergy, as well as Laity, in Temporals only, is both frivolous, and contrary to the plain Meaning of the Act.* It is indeed, if That be *All.* But who told Him that no more is meant than Supremacy over the Clergy, as well as Laity, in Temporals only? It is ſaid over all *Eſtates*, and *Degrees*; which implies more than all *Men*: All Eſtates, and Degrees; i. e. *as ſuch*; Which includes *Things* as well as *Perſons.* If it be objected that I *interpret* the *Interpretation* arbitrarily; I reply, I do not: Becauſe the Interpretation † refers to the Queen's Injunctions; and the *Duty, and Allegiance acknowledg'd to be due* to *Henry* VIII. and *Edward* VI. which in

* 13 *Eliz.* Chap. 12. ſee *Wood* Inſtit. *P.* 52, 54. † *See* Art. 37. and Q. *Eliz's.* Injunct. *Sparrow's* Collect. P. 77, 78.

the

the ſtrongeſt Terms (too ſtrong in our Author's Opinion, and perhaps in Mine likewiſe) relates to Cauſes, and Things, as well as Perſons. † The Word *Cauſes* is expreſs'd in another Part of This very Article; which cannot be ſuppos'd to recede from it's own Words. And This is the Language of our Church in her Canons: *That the King is Supreme in Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical.* See Can. I. II. LV. Our Author therefore might have ſpar'd his Pains in proving ſo triumphantly what Nobody denies (a Task in which upon all Occaſions he takes great Delight) ‡ that Eccleſiaſtical, or Spiritual THINGS and CAUSES are in expreſs Terms mention'd in the Oath annex'd to the Act of Supremacy, and the Senſe of them contain'd in the Act itſelf: But his Inference from it, that therefore the Explanation in the 37th. Article is inconſiſtent with the Act and Oath, is vain and groundleſs. The moſt can be ſaid is, that the *Explication* might have been more *explicit*; and I own it might: But That infers not Inconſiſtency, or Contradiction. But I am foreſtalling myſelf; To return therefore.

The Way being thus clear'd by a true *general State* of the Matter before us; our Author's *particular Reaſonings* will be anſwered *with a great deal of Eaſe.*

† See Act of *Suprem.* 26 *Hen.* VIII. Cap. 1. ‡ P. 251.

* *It*

* *It is frivolous*, ſays He, [meaning the Interpretation of the Act in the Article] *becauſe it renders the Act itſelf a mere Mock-Act*—— *For what Man in his Senſes ever doubted but that a Sovereign Prince — has the Supreme Authority over both Clergy, and Laity, in Temporal Concerns?* &c. He then argues that if no more had been meant by the Act; it would not have met with ſo much Oppoſition: Giving a particular Account of That Oppoſition, which ſhall be elſewhere conſidered; and draws the ſame Inference from Biſhop *Heath*'s Speech. That Prelate, if he at all argued as he is repreſented to have done, † *argued like a Child* upon a different Account from That here mention'd: I mean by miſtaking the Queſtion in the other Extreme; not by ſuppoſing that the Act of Supremacy gave ſo *little Power* as our Author repreſents the 37th Article to intend; but that it gave *much more* than ever was by it ſelf intended. For he ſuppoſes it gave the Queen Authority to preach, and adminiſter the Sacraments, *&c.* which was a more Childiſh Suppoſition than the other. But this Speech, upon which our Author lays ſo much Streſs as to ‡ recite This Part of it at large, *muſt* (as Biſhop *Burnet* obſerves ‖) *have been a Forgery put out*

* P. 248, 249. † P. 249. ‡ P. 243, to P. 247.
‖ Hiſt. Ref. Vol. 2. P. 387.

in

in his Name. For he is made to speak of the Supremacy, as a new and unheard of Thing. Which he, who had sworn to it so often in K. Henry's, *and K.* Edward's *Times, could not have the Face to say.* For the rest, I have answered This Paragraph already; since it proceeds upon a Supposition that the Explanation in the Article makes the Supremacy mean no more than a Supremacy in Temporals, which I have shewn to be false.

Upon the same wrong Principle he deceives himself, or labours to deceive others, in what follows. * *But this Interpretation of the Act is not only frivolous; but over and above inconsistent with the Words both of the Act and the Oath annex'd to it.* He recites them; and then proceeds, telling us, that if This Act, and Oath, did not fix the Supreme Ecclesiastical Authority in Q. *Elizabeth*; *Words must lose their obvious Signification.* I say so too; And with This the Article is entirely consistent. But then he goes on, and gives a wrong Turn to every Thing; making the Act and Oath import much more than They really do.

† *First, the Act itself gave the Queen all such Spiritual, and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in general, as by any Spiritual, and Ecclesiastical Authority had ever been, and*

---

* P. 249. † P. 250.

can

can lawfully be exerciſed. This is a ſhameful Prevarication; After the Word *exerciſed*, it follows Thus; " or uſed: for the Viſitati- " on of the Eccleſiaſtical State, and Perſons, " and for Reformation, Order, and Cor- " rection of the ſame, and of all manner of Hereſies, Errors, *&c.* which manifeſtly reſtrains it to *outward Juriſdiction*: Whereas the Omiſſion of thoſe Words quite alters the Senſe, and extends it to *all* Spiritual Authority. * *And was not This declaring Her Supreme Head*, &c. She was not ſtiled ſo; but let That paſs. † *Was it not veſting in her Perſon all the Juriſdiction which any Eccleſiaſtical Perſon*, &c? No. For the Words, however they may ſound, are capable of another Senſe; and have been explain'd accordingly, both by other Words, and by conſtant Practice. That ſhe was veſted with the *ſame Power*, with *all the Authority*, which any Eccleſiaſtical Perſon had ever exerciſed, is neither expreſs'd, nor imply'd. All the World knows ſhe was not: This Author himſelf both knows, and has ſaid, ſhe was not; For he grants, as we have ſeen, that even *Henry* VIII. was not inveſted with the Power of Preaching, and Adminiſtering the Sacraments; And I preſume he will not affirm that Q. *Elizabeth*

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

had

had more Power than her Father, the Act of Supremacy in his Reign being more full and strong than That in hers

* 2*dly*, *It gave her a special Power or Authority, to visit, reform, and correct all manner of Errors, Heresies, and Schisms*, &c. *All which are properly Exercises of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, &c. They are so; and the Crown has Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction (how far, and in what Sense, we shall hereafter explain) and so have the Clergy too: And the One does not destroy the Other, as this Writer would have it believed. † *And tho' in Bishops they are limited to their respective Dioceses, and sometimes restrain'd by particular Exceptions; the full exercise of this Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction was on the contrary, by virtue of the aforesaid Act, granted to Q.* Elizabeth *over all the Dioceses in her Dominions without Restriction, or Limitation.* That is, the Queen's Jurisdiction extended over all her Dominions; Whereas That of every Bishop is limited to his own Dioceses. Had This Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction been at all *granted* to her (for, as we must still remember, it was not granted, but only declar'd) it would have been strange indeed, had it not extended over all her Dominions.

---

* *Ibid.* † *P.* 251.

What

What Trifling is This! * *But 3dly. the Oath annex'd to the Act declares in expreſs Terms*, &c. In ſhort it declares the Queen Supreme in all THINGS and CAUSES Eccleſiaſtical, &c. † *Which differs very much from the other, and imports no leſs than that ſhe was the Supreme Judge of all Controverſies in Religion.* It does not import that ſhe was Supreme Judge, or any Judge, in Controverſies of Religion: She might by her Authority reform Errors, Hereſies, *&c.* and yet be adviſed by her Clergy what was an Error, or a Hereſy. ‡— *And the Source of all Eccleſiaſtical, as well as Temporal Juriſdiction in her Dominions. Becauſe as all Temporal Authority or Juriſdiction in every Government flows from the Secular Head, ſo all Spiritual Juriſdiction flows from the Spiritual Head, as from it's Source.* I anſwer; Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction is of two Sorts: External, and Internal. The Firſt is, with Us, partly in the Civil Magiſtrate, partly in the Clergy: The Second wholly in the Clergy. It is the Former only that is meant in the Act, and the Oath. In the coercive, or coactive Part of This, which conſiſts in impoſing outward Penalties, the King is not only Supreme; but from him, as from the Source,

* *P.* 251. † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

all the Power is deriv'd. The regulative, or directive Part of it, as making Eccleſiaſtical Laws and Canons, is jointly in the Crown, and Clergy. Here too the King is Supreme, while he at all Acts. But the Power is not *originally* (in the *higheſt* and moſt *proper* Senſe of the Word originally) derived from Him as the Source: Becauſe if the State ſhould break off from the Church, perſecute, and endeavour to deſtroy it; the Church, as a Society inſtituted by Chriſt, muſt have a Right to make Laws by herſelf, becauſe no Society can ſubſiſt without Laws. The latter, Internal Juriſdiction, conſiſts in binding, or abſolving; remitting, or retaining Sins, Concerning the Senſe of which it is not our Buſineſs here to diſpute. Beſides which Power of *Juriſdiction*, there is alſo a Power of *Order*, which conſiſts in Preaching, Adminiſtering the Sacraments, Ordaining, *&c.* Both theſe Powers, That of *internal* Juriſdiction, and That of *Order*, are derived from Chriſt alone as from their Head and Source. The Civil Magiſtrate can neither give them, nor execute them; tho' he may limit, regulate and determine the Exerciſe of them, as to Time, Place, and other Circumſtances: And has Authority to ſee that the Clergy do their Duty in the Execution of theſe Offices.

The

The *Regal Supremacy* therefore which we intend, is no other than (as Primate * *Bramhall* ſpeaks) *the Political, or External Regimen of the Church.* And ſince I have mention'd That great Prelate; I will from Him cite a remarkable Paſſage relating to our Preſent Subject. † "There are "ſeveral Heads of the Church. Chriſt a- "lone is the Spiritual Head; The Sove- "reign Prince the Political Head; the Ec- "cleſiaſtical Head is a general Council; "and under That, each Patriarch in his "Patriarchate, and among the Patriarchs, "the Biſhop of *Rome*, by a Priority of Or- "der. We who maintain the King to be "the Political Head of the *Engliſh* Church "do not deny the Spiritual Headſhip of "Chriſt, nor the Supreme Power of the "Repreſentative Church, that is a Gene- "ral Council, or Synod; nor the executive "Headſhip of each Patriarch in his Patri- "archate; nor the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Head- "ſhip of Order, among them.——We have "introduc'd no new Form of Eccleſiaſtical "Government into the Church of *England*; "but preſerved to every one his due Right, "if he will accept of it. And We have "the ſame Dependance upon our Eccleſia-

* Schiſm Guarded. P. 340. † P. 388.

" ſtical Superiors, as we had evermore " from the Primitive Times."

But Thoſe Words, *The King is the Fountain of all manner of Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction and Authority*, will perhaps be ſtill inſiſted upon. I anſwer, 1ſt. They are not in the Act of Parliament concerning the Supremacy; but only in the Commiſſions in King *Henry*'s, and King *Edward*'s Times, which We have nothing to do with. 2dly. Thoſe Words themſelves, tho' us'd very improperly, *cannot* mean what they *ſeem* to mean, but only *all manner* of *External, or Political* Juriſdiction in Eccleſiaſtical Affairs. Becauſe, as I have been often forced to ſay, it is agreed by all the World that the Power of Adminiſtering, Preaching, and Ordaining, was never by any body ſuppoſed to be deriv'd from the Crown. Even K. *Henry*'s Statute of Supremacy, tho' every Expreſſion in it may not be ſtrictly right, may with This moſt true Explication be very well juſtified. He is declar'd Supreme Head of the Church of *England*; *i. ë.* in reſpect of the External, and Political Regimen of the Church. It is ſaid, that " He " ſhall have Power to viſit, redreſs, and re- " form all ſuch Hereſies as by any manner " of Spiritual Authority lawfully may be " reformed." But, to uſe the Words of an ingenious

ingenious and learned Writer: * " This Act " will be without the reach of our Au- " thor's Cavils; if it be obſerv'd, That the " Power by which the King viſits, and " reforms, is not *Spiritual*, but *Political*; " that a Power is not given him to *de-* " *clare* Errors, but to *repreſs* them; that " the Determination of *Hereſy* is by Act " of Parliament limited to the Scriptures, " firſt General Councils, and Aſſent of " the Clergy in their Convocation: That " the King hath not all the Power given him " which by any manner of Spiritual Au- " thority may be lawfully exerciſed, (for " He has not the Power of the Keys) but " a Power given him to reform all Hereſies " by the Civil Authority, which the Church " can do by her Spiritual; *&c.* —— " Laſtly, that the Prince is oblig'd to take " care that all Acts of reforming be exe- " cuted by their proper Miniſters; becauſe " elſe he trangreſſes the Power preſcrib'd " in This Statute, *ſo to reform as may be* " *moſt to the Pleaſure of Almighty God.*" Indeed all thoſe concluding Words —— " moſt to the Pleaſure of Almighty God, the " Increaſe of Vertue in Chriſt's Religion, " and the Conſervation of the Peace and " Tranquility of the Realm, any Uſage, " Cuſtoms, *foreign Laws*, *foreign Pre-*

* Reflections on the Hiſtorical Part of Church-Government, *&c. P.* 24, 25.

" *ſcriptions*, or any Thing or Things to the " contrary thereof notwithſtanding," are plainly explanatory of the whole Act; confining it to the Aſſerting a Supremacy over the Church in a *Political* Senſe only, and excluding all *foreign* Authority and Juriſdiction whatſoever. It may here be very properly remark'd that the Clergy in their Declaration, upon which This Act was founded, acknowledge the King to be Head of the Church, only *quantum per legem Chriſti licet*; ſo far as is agreeable to the Law of Chriſt.

What has been offer'd will give us an eaſy Key to unlock all our Author's Fallacies, in his Reaſonings from this Act under the three Heads I before hinted at. * *In the firſt Place*, ſays he, *it made him Supreme Judge in all Controverſies in Religion, by giving him full Power to viſit all Errors, and Hereſies*, &c. This does not make him Supreme Judge, or any Judge, in Controverſies; as I have obſerved of Q. *Elizabeth.* † *The plain meaning of which is*, &c. in ſhort, *that he had the ſame Power as the Pope had Before.* The plain Meaning of it is no ſuch Thing; nor can any ſuch Thing be inferr'd from it; nor is it true in Fact, that the ſame Power was given to Him as the

* P. 190. † *Ibid.*

Pope

Pope had. See backwards. P. 323 *&c* Neither had He, (* as This Writer affirms) *The ſame Power as the Biſhops in their ſeveral Dioceſſes*: Becauſe he had no Power purely Spiritual by Vertue of a Commiſſion from Chriſt; as all Biſhops have.

† *But 2dly. By impowering him to viſit with Supreme Authority, it united, as I may ſay, in his Perſon alone the Whole Epiſcopal Juriſdiction of the Nation.* You may not ſay it; becauſe you cannot ſay it with Truth. He had in his own Perſon none of the Epiſcopal Juriſdiction purely Spiritual, and derived from Chriſt; and ſo not the Whole. And even *his outward* Juriſdiction made him only Superintendent over the Biſhops, but did not take away Theirs. ‡ *Which* Epiſcopal Juriſdiction *before was divided, as in other National Churches, among the Biſhops.* So it was afterwards, and is ſtill. ‖ *To whom alone it belong'd to viſit.* To them alone it belong'd to viſit, as Biſhops; and ſo it does ſtill: But, notwithſtanding That, the King might viſit as a King. *And that only in their own reſpective Dioceſſes, according to the Canons.* Doubtleſs, a Biſhop was, and ſtill is, to viſit only in his own Dioceſs, and according to the Canons: But to

---

* *Ibid.* † P. 191. ‡ *Ibid.* ‖ *Ibid.*

what Purpoſe This was here inſerted, I cannot imagine. *So that it degraded in a manner the whole Prelatick Order.* Not at all, for the Reaſon above alledg'd. *Or at leaſt rendered the Exerciſe of their Juriſdiction wholly precarious.* Not ſo; Becauſe the Act does not meddle with ſome Part of their Juriſdiction; and even That which it does meddle with may have a paramount Authority over it, and yet not be wholly precarious: Which is actually the Caſe; as every body knows. *And they were after no better than the King's Vicars,* &c. *Which was giving him a greater Power than any Pope,* &c. Not ſo; for the Reaſons aforeſaid. 3*dly. It gave the King a Power to reviſe and annul any Eccleſiaſtical Decree or Conſtitution, tho' enacted by the whole Body of the Engliſh Clergy.* How ſo? There are no ſuch Words in the Act, as He himſelf cites it: Nor was it ever deſign'd to veſt a Legiſlative Power in the King only, with reſpect to the Church, any more than to the State. *Who by that Means were diveſted of their divine Right of feeding and guiding their Flocks; and became meer Executors of the King's arbitrary Will.* Utterly falſe; as I have fully prov'd. I will further only remind our Author that ſuppoſing all This to be as bad as he would make it; Papiſts, not Proteſtants, are to anſwer for it.

The

The Account therefore of the whole Matter is no more than This. Our Kings have, as they ought to have, a *Political Supremacy* in *Eccleſiaſtical Affairs*. Some, who are far enough from favouring the *Romiſh* Cauſe, cannot be reconciled to the Word *Eccleſiaſtical*, much leſs *Spiritual*, added to That *Supremacy*; but will call it a Civil Supremacy in Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes. Which, to my Apprehenſion, is a mere Logomachy; conſidering how Thoſe who uſe it explain their Meaning even of the Word Eccleſiaſtical, as apply'd to That Supremacy. Or if they pleaſe, they may take it Thus. There is a Difference between Spiritual, or Eccleſiaſtical Power, and a Power in Spiritual, or Eccleſiaſtical Things: Which Latter, not the Former, is the Language of our Laws and Canons upon This Subject.

Not but that, were it otherwiſe; there would be no reaſonable Ground of Complaint. The Words of the Great *Conſtantine* to the Biſhops, recited by *Euſebius*; † are very remarkable; And we hear of no Objection to them. Which, methinks, ſhould have ſome Weight with our Adverſaries. "You, ſays He, are Biſhops of "Thoſe Things that are within the Church;

† *De Vita Conſtant. Lib. IV. Cap* 24.

"I

"I am a Biſhop as to externals." If it be ſaid that the Latter Words may relate to ſecular Things; I anſwer it is far more probable from the Connexion of the Narative, that they relate to the externals of the Church: And 'tis plain Fact that *Conſtantine* deeply intermeddled in Church Matters. This, I ſay, is very material; both as a Proof, and an Explanation, of ſuch a Supremacy as we maintain. For the further Confirmation of which, ſee many other Teſtimonies of the ancient Church, cited by the excellent Dr. *Hammond*, in his Diſcourſe of Schiſm. Two of them I cannot forbear tranſcribing. *I am King and Prieſt*, ſaid *Leo Iſaurus* to *Gregory* the 2d. And was not for This reprehended by That Pope. And by *Optatus* † it is noted and cenſur'd as a Schiſmatical Piece of Language in the *Donatiſts*; *Quid Imperatori cum Eccleſia?* What has the Emperor to do with the Church?

By this time, I hope, any one may give a ready Anſwer to all Objections about Lay-Supremacy in Eccleſiaſtical Matters. However This or That Commiſſion, or Act of Parliament, is worded; *it does not*, it *cannot* mean what our Adverſaries pretend. Words muſt be explain'd by other Words;

† Lib. 3.

and

and Laws by univerſal Practice. Even That ſo much decry'd Expreſſion *Head of the Church*, explain'd as we have ſeen it was ever meant, is not ſo very wicked and abſurd; no not when apply'd to a *Child*, or a *Woman*. A ſuppoſed Incongruity, which our Author repeats, I verily believe, above twenty times; as if it were Matter of the greateſt Triumph over us, that This Title, or one equivalent to it, was given to *Edward* VI. in his Minority, and to Q. *Elizabeth*. Whereas it is well known to All who know any thing of Theſe Matters, that as the King of *England* never dies, ſo the King of *England* is never a Child; and the Regal Authority is of no Sex. A Headſhip of the Church ſtrictly ſpeaking, *i. e.* an Authority purely Spiritual, can no more belong to a Layman, than to a Woman, or a Child; but leſs properly ſpeaking, which is what We mean, it may belong to either of the two Laſt, as well as to the Firſt; becauſe it is inherent in the Crown, whoever wears it. Since our Author ſo very often repeats This Objection, and inſiſts ſo very much upon it; I cannot forbear ſaying, that 'tis an Objection fit only for a *Child*: A *Woman*, of Common Reaſon and Ingenuity, would be aſhamed of it.

Not

Not that We are bound, after all, to defend every Rhetorical, improper, or ſtrain'd Expreſſion in This or That Act of Parliament. Our Author (that I may here borrow ‡ Biſhop *Burnet's* Words) is much more "concern'd to juſtify all Papal Bulls, than "We can be to juſtify all the Words of our "Laws; eſpecially the Rhetorick that is "in their Preambles. Becauſe He believes the Pope to be at leaſt the Centre of Unity, if not Infallible; and we do not pretend that our Parliament is Either. "Now when our "Author will undertake to juſtify all the "Preambles of Bulls that are in the "*Bullarium*; then We may undertake "to juſtify all the Flouriſhes which may "be in any Act of Parliament." Laws are ſometimes expreſs'd in ſuch Terms as Practice only, and other Laws, and legal Interpretations, can explain. Our Adverſaries are very clamorous againſt Theſe Expreſſions, *The King is Head of the Church*, He has Power *to repreſs Hereſies*, &c. What would they have ſaid, were the *King* ſtil'd a *Biſhop*? Yet *Conſtantine* call'd himſelf ſo. What if he were ſtiled a *Prieſt*? Yet *Leo Iſaurus* called himſelf ſo. And no Exception was taken at Either: Becauſe the Meaning was explain'd, and well under-

‡ Apud *Hickes* Treat. of the Prieſth. Prof. P. 150.

ſtood;

ſtood; tho' the Expreſſions were much more harſh and improper, than any in the Acts of Parliament we are now conſidering.

The *Submiſſion of the Clergy*, ſo much thrown in our Teeth, and particularly inſiſted upon by this Author, † was the Act of Papiſts; the ſame Papiſts who complimented *Henry* VIII. for writing againſt *Luther*. Not that it was *an entire Submiſſion to the King in matters of Religion*, as our Author moſt falſely calls it; but only a Submiſſion, not an entire one neither, in matters of Convocation, in making, promulging, and executing Canons *&c.* Whatever it was, let Them anſwer for it, that made it: They did not promiſe for their Succeſſors; Or if They had, I do not ſee that ſuch a Promiſe would have oblig'd their Succeſſors: For it was a mere Promiſe, not a Law; And beſides what they did in K. *Henry*'s Reign they undid in Q. *Mary*'s: Nor is there any ſuch Submiſſion, as an Act of the Clergy, now Subſiſting. There is indeed an Act of Parliament founded upon That Submiſſion; which our Lawyers ‡ tell us is declaratory of the Common Law. Notwithſtanding which, if our Adverſaries can ſhew that it is contrary to the Law of God; we will

† P. 185. *&c.* ‡ *Coke* 4. Inſtit. 323: apud *Wood* Inſtit. *P.* 864.

cer-

certainly refuse Obedience to it. But whatever is, or can be, said against it may receive an Answer from what has been already discours'd concerning the Power of the Civil State in Ecclesiastical Matters: And I am for as little Repetition as possible.

As to the *Fear* † by which This Submission of the Clergy is said to have been extorted; 1st. Our Author misapprehends the Fact. The *Premunire* was relax'd, by Act of Parliament long before the Submission was made. But since the Case was confessedly otherwise, when the same Clergy acknowledg'd the King's Headship of the Church; I answer, 2dly. A Man, or Number of Men, may do a Thing purely out of Fear; and yet it may not be unlawful, nay it may be their Duty. 3dly. The Occasion of their Debates might be Fear; and yet the Result of them be guided by Truth, and Reason, and Conviction of Conscience.

Nearly related to what we are now upon, is our Author's Objection against the *Committee* of *sixteen Clergy*, and *sixteen Laity*, appointed to *examine*, *confirm*, or *annul*, certain *Constitutions* and *Canons*, &c. *i. e.* in short to reform the Canon Law. And most unfortunate it was that so useful and excellent a Work was not Then, nor at any other Time, effected. *Here*, says He, *we have a Committee establish'd of thirty two Persons*

† P. 185.

half

half Laymen &c. Why ſhould they not be half Laymen; when the Prerogative of the Crown, and the Libertys and Benefit of the Subject, were as much concern'd as the Rights of the Church? This Writer ſeems to forget Thoſe Words, in the Preamble of the Act: "And where divers Conſtutions, Or-"dinances, and Canons, Provincial, or Syno-"dal, which heretofore have been enacted, "and be thought not only to be much prejudi-"cial to the King's Prerogative Royal, and re-"pugnant to the Laws and Statutes of this "Realm, but alſo overmuch onerous to his "Highneſs and his Subjects." † *So that if the "Sixteen Laymen* (continues He)——*could but gain over to their Side any one Clergy-man of the whole Committee, which was to be entirely model'd, and pack'd by the Court; any thing they pleaſed was ſure to paſs.* It does not neceſſarily follow that they muſt be entirely pack'd by the Court, becauſe the King is to Name them. But, however, be it ſo; and morever let One of the Clergy be gain'd over to the Lay-Side; it does not follow that any Miſchief to the Church muſt happen. The Lay-men may be well enough affected to the Church, and the Churchmen to the State. There is Danger in ſuch Caſes, I confeſs: But who can help it? Nothing in this World is certain and ſecure. It is poſſible on the o-

† P. 184, 185.

ther

ther hand, that the Clergy may draw off one of the Laity; and no Harm done to the State neither. But at worſt, let it be remember'd that This whole Affair was founded upon a Petition of the Clergy, the Popiſh Clergy. *The ſaid Clergy* (ſays the Act) *hath moſt humbly beſought — that the ſaid Conſtitutions be committed to —— thirty two —— whereof ſixteen to be ——of the Temporalty*, &c.

And This brings us to the laſt Branch of this Objection againſt the Reformation; and it would be a *terrible* one indeed, if it were *true*. According to the Account ‡ given by this Writer and the Biſhop of *Meaux*, That great Work was effected *wholly*, or *almoſt* wholly, by the *Civil Power*; the *Eccleſiaſtical* had *little* or *no* Hand in it. Whereas in the three Reigns under Conſideration, there was nothing done with regard to the Church and Religion, "but what was acted by the Clergy "in their Convocations, or grounded on "ſome Act of Theirs precedent to it, "with the Advice, Council, and Conſent "of the Biſhops, and other learned Men "Aſſembled by the King's [or Queen's] Ap-"pointment; and the Parliaments did no-"thing in it, but that ſometimes upon the

‡ 3d. Dial. and Pref. *paſſim*.

Poſt-

"Poſt-fact, it was thought fit to add ſome "ſtrength to the Decrees and Determina- "tion of the Church (eſpecially in inflicting "Puniſhments on the Diſobedienne) by Ci- "vil Sanctions." This is fully ſhewn by Dr. *Heylin* in a Treatiſe written on Purpoſe: * Part of the Preface to which I have now recited. As the Treatiſe is ſhort, I refer the Reader to the Whole: To quote all from it which confirms our Cauſe, would be to tranſcribe almoſt every Sentence in it. Our Author makes great Uſe of Dr. *Heylin*, and cites him very frequently: Let Us be permitted to make ſome Uſe of him in our Turn.

In ſhort, the *Reforming* Temporal Powers meddled no more with Religious Matters in the three Reigns aforeſaid, than the *Popiſh* Temporal Powers did in Q. *Mary*'s. That Queen and her Parliament as much eſtabliſh'd *Popery*, as any Prince or Parliament eſtabliſh'd *Proteſtantiſm*: And the Clergy had as great a Share in making the Reformation, as They had in any Publick Act in Q. *Mary*'s Reign. So that Ours is as much a Spiritual, or Eccleſiaſtical Religion, as Theirs; and Theirs was as much a State Religion, or Parliament Religion, as Ours.

---

* Reformation of the Ch. of *Engl.* juſtified.

But, says the Bishop of *Meaux*, * *from the Time of* Henry's *assuming the Supremacy* (he should have said, from the Time of the *Clergy's Submission*) *the Clergy had no Authority to intermeddle in Religious Matters, unless they had his Orders for it.* He should have said, his *Permission*, or *License*. † *And the only Remonstrance they made against this Hardship put upon them was, that it was an Encroachment upon their Privileges.* He does not tell us where he met with this History; nor can I tell Anybody else. Not that it at all affects the Merits of the Cause on either Side; whether it be true, or false. ‡ *As if the meddling in Matters of Religion were but a bare Privilege, not an essential Prerogative of the Ecclesiastical Order.* To meddle with Matters of Religion, absolutely, and simply speaking, is not a bare Privilege, but an essential Prerogative, of the Ecclesiastical Order; but to meddle with *some* Matters of Religion, in such or such a *Manner*, at such or such a Time or Place, with such or such other *Circumstances*, is neither an essential Prerogativ, nor an Essential Privilege belonging to it. For Example; according to the Practise of the Church, both Jewish, and

---

* P. 33. *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

Christian

Chriſtian, as well as to the Nature and Reaſon of the Thing, no Synods ought to be held, nor Eccleſiaſtical Laws to be made, without the Concurrence of the Civil Power.

* In *Edward* the Sixth's Time, the Biſhop informs us, *the Parliament took upon itſelf to regulate the Form of conſecrating Biſhops, or Prieſts, and to preſcribe the Form of Publick Prayers, and the Manner of adminiſtering the Sacraments.* Would not any one think by This, That the Parliament *made* Thoſe Forms, and *originally*, and *of itſelf, preſcrib'd* That Manner? When in truth the Parliament did but impoſe upon the People, what the Clergy had before drawn up; and enforce it with temporal Sanctions. See *Heylin's Reformation juſtified*, P. 15, 16. The Biſhop further tells us that in the ſame Reign (King *Edward* the Sixth's) *the Convocation of the Clergy only beg'd of the Parliament that no Statute might paſs concerning Religion without their Advice; but it could not be obtain'd.* I have read that the Lower Houſe deſir'd the Upper to make ſuch a Requeſt to the King, and Parliament; but That *it could not be obtain'd*, I can no where find. It is Fact that no ſuch Law was made, without the Advice of the

* P. 32.

Clergy; and That is enough. That the King's Visitors * *requir'd of the Bishops an express Declaration that they would teach such Doctrines, as should from time to time be establish'd and explain'd by the King and Clergy*, is likewise History of his own; as far as I can perceive: However, He himself does not pretend that the Bishops agreed to it. As for the King's *prohibiting Preaching*, for some time; 'twas nothing but what was proper, and just: And Q. *Mary* did the same Thing.

But there is another dreadful Article against us, still behind. Our Author spends a whole Section ‖ and Part of another, to prove that Q. *Elizabeth*'s Supremacy was establish'd by the *Secular Power* only, without the *Concurrence or Consent of the Clergy*. And This, he imagines, must quite confound us; and utterly overturn the whole Fabrick of the Reformation. He begins Thus. *But as the Establishment and Constitution of the Reform'd Church of* England, *as it now stands, was built upon a wrong Foundation; to wit, the Spiritual Supremacy of a Person incapable by her very Sex even of the lowest Degree of Ecclesiastical Dignity, or Function*—Please to observe how This strong Reasoning looks, after it

---

* *Ibid.* † P. 34. ‖ Sect. 10, 11

has

has been fully anſwered, and expos'd. Our Reformation is not founded upon the Supremacy, tho' the Acknowledgement of the Supremacy prepar'd the Way to it; but upon the Word of God, and eternal Truth: And as for Q. *Elizabeth*'s Sex, enough I hope has been ſaid of That. * *So has* IT *another eſſential Flaw that never will be repair'd; I mean the Nullity of that very Power, or Authority, by which* IT *was eſtabliſh'd. For* IT *was carry'd entirely by the ſecular Power*, &c. By which *It* he means the *Supremacy*; tho' good Syntax would make one think he meant the *Reformation*. The Subſtance of all he alledges is, that every Thing relating to the Supremacy was done wholly by the Parliament, the Church having no Hand in it; and that even in Parliament all the Biſhops, except One, were againſt it. To which I anſwer, 1ſt. The Queen's Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy was not Then *given* her, but only *declar'd*: She had it Before, by the Laws of the Land, and right Reaſon, in vertue of her Sovereignty; as it has already appear'd. And ſurely the Parliament had a Right, and Authority, without the Convocation, to declare the Laws and Conſtitutions of the Realm. And that the

* *Ibid.*

Biſhops in Parliament were outvoted, is, I hope, no Argument That the Proceedings of That Aſſembly were illegal. 2dly. It is nothing Strange that Thoſe Popiſh Biſhops (for ſo They were) ſhould oppoſe the Reformation; towards which They knew the Aſſerting of the Supremacy was a great Step. Not but that 3dly. Moſt of them had before been *for* the Supremacy; I mean, in the Reigns of *Henry* VIII. and *Edward* VI. Both Houſes of Convocation, the main Body of the Clergy, Biſhops as well as Presbyters, had acknowledg'd it: And among the Reſt, the greater Number of Theſe very Biſhops themſelves. 4thly. The whole Body of the Clergy, not long afterwards, acknowledg'd the Supremacy of Q. *Elizabeth*; and in the ſtrongeſt Terms ratify'd, and confirm'd it, by the publick Act of both Houſes of Convocation, in the 39 Articles. To This it is objected, * that in order to ſerve That Turn, the old Biſhops were depriv'd, and new ones put in their Places, by illegal Means, and an inſufficient Authority. I anſwer with Dr. *Hammond*. † Firſt, "That the Death of "Cardinal *Pool*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, "falling near upon the Death of her Pre-"deceſſor Q. *Mary*; it was very regular

* *P.* 258, 259. &c. † Works in Folio. P. 225, 226

"for-

" for Q. *Elizabeth* to aſſign a Succeſſor
" to That See then vacant, Archbiſhop
" *Parker*. Secondly, That Thoſe Biſhops
" which in Q. *Mary*'s Days had been ex-
" il'd, or depriv'd, and ſurviv'd That Ca-
" lamity, were with all Juſtice reſtor'd
" to their Dignities. Thirdly, That the
" Biſhops by Her [Q. *Elizabeth*] diveſted,
" and depriv'd of their Dignities, were ſo
" dealt with, for refuſing to take the Oath
" of Supremacy, form'd and enjoin'd in the
" Days of *Henry* VIII. and in the firſt Par-
" liament of This Queen reviv'd, and the
" Statutes concerning it reſtor'd to full
" Force, before it was Thus impos'd on them.
" So that for the Juſtice of the Cauſe of
" their deprivation, it depends immediately
" upon the Right and Power of the Su-
" preme Magiſtrate to make Laws, to im-
" poſe Oaths, for the ſecuring of his Go-
" vernment, and to inflict the Puniſhments
" preſcrib'd by the Laws, on the Diſobedi-
" ent; but originally upon the Truth of
" That Deciſion of the Biſhops, and Cler-
" gy, and Univerſities, in the Reign of
" *Henry* VIII. That no Authority belong'd
" in This Kingdom of *England* to the Bi-
" ſhop of *Rome*, more than to any other
" foreign Biſhop. The Former of Theſe
" I ſhall be confident to look upon as an
" undoubted Truth, in the Maintainance
" of which all Government is concern'd,

" and hath nothing peculiar to our Preten-
" ſions, which ſhould ſuggeſt a Vindication
" of it in this Place. And the Second
" hath, I ſuppoſe, been ſufficiently clear'd
" in the former Chapters of this Diſcourſe;
" which have examin'd all the Biſhop of
" *Rome*'s Claims to This Supremacy. And
" Both theſe Grants being acknowledg'd, or
" ſuppoſed ('till they be invalidated, or diſ-
" proved) to have Truth and Force in them;
" the Concluſion will be ſufficiently induc'd,
" That there was no Injuſtice in That Act
" of the Queen's which diveſted Thoſe Bi-
" ſhops, who thus refus'd to ſecure her Go-
" vernment, or to approve their Fidelity to
" their lawful Sovereign."

It is further objected, * That the Generality of the inferiour Clergy concur'd out of *Hope*, *Fear*, *Lazineſs*, *Love of the World*, &c. The Strength and Charitableneſs of which Argument have already been ſeveral times taken notice of. Yet I cannot here avoid remarking upon the Compariſon he makes between † the *Fatiguing Duties incumbent on the Paſtors of the Catholick Church, and the eaſy Lives, comparatively, of Proteſtant Miniſters*; as He is pleaſed to ſpeak: *Between which*, He tells us, *there is as great Difference as between the broad*

---

* *Ibid.* P. 261.

and

and narrow Way mention'd in the Goſpel. Decent, and handſome, I muſt needs ſay! But as for the † Maſſes, and daily long Offices, Confeſſions, five times more Holy-days than We have, frequent publick Services for the Dead, and ſo forth, incumbent upon the *Catholick* Paſtors; They are indeed ſufficiently laborious: And They may take their Labour for their Pains. *Who hath requir'd theſe things at their Hands?* Theſe, and abundance more, are ſo many Fopperies, and Fooleries, of their own Inventing; contrary to the Spirit of Chriſtianity, doing infinite Miſchief to Religion, and the Souls of Men; and therefore no great Matter of *Boaſting*. On the other hand, the Church of *England* Clergy are ſufficiently *burthen'd with Paſtoral Cares*; Many of them, eſpecially in This City, and in all great Pariſhes, ‖ *in danger of being overburthen'd with them.* Nor has every one of them ‡ *a good Living ſerving to maintain a Female Companion in a Comfortable Way.* I could not but tranſcribe That cutting Sentence of the young Gentleman's; becauſe he who put it into his Mouth, I ſuppoſe, imagin'd it to be Wit: And I would by all means have both his Wit, and good Manners, as well as Arguments,

† *Ibid.* ‖ *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

appear

appear and ſhine in their full Luſtre. Notwithſtanding which, 'tis very fit that every one of the Clergy, if He pleaſes, *ſhould have a Female Companion*; and 'tis *damnably wicked* to make it *unlawful*: As We have proved a hundred times over; let Him prove the Contrary, if he can. Great, however, is the Burthen of our Parochial Cures (tho' it is a Burthen purely Chriſtian, not Popiſh) conſidering the Labour of the Church-Service, Adminiſtering the Sacraments, conſtant Preaching Catechizing and Expounding the Catechiſm, Viſiting the Sick, Inſtructing the Ignorant, reclaiming the Vicious; ſo that we can ill *afford time* to *anſwer Popiſh Books*, and antidote the Venom of *Popiſh Prieſts*, who in This Town are ſupoſed to be as numerous as Thoſe of the Church of *England*. In behalf of which Latter, I think we may add this further Conſideration, That They are of the Eſtabliſhment, whether They be in the Right, or in the Wrong: It does not therefore become their *Romiſh* Adverſaries, in this Nation, to vilify and outrage them, to treat them with Inſolence and Contempt; as This Writer does. Were I in a Popiſh Country, I ſhould think myſelf guilty of exceeding ill Manners, ſhould I Thus treat Their Clergy; and that too, if I could do it with Safety: As I am ſure I could not. So far otherwiſe; that

that I could not, without the utmoſt Danger of Impriſonment and Death, endeavour to promote my own Religion; tho' I treated the Clergy, and all other Profeſſors of Theirs, with the greateſt Reſpect. Which, by the Way, is not equal Dealing.

Now I am upon This, I think it proper to beſtow a Remark upon what our Author ſays in another Place. Where, after a moſt impertinent Piece of Sophiſtry, tending to prove that becauſe Biſhop *Pearſon* made it neceſſary to be of the Church, therefore he muſt needs ſerve the Cauſe of Popery; he imputes That excellent Prelate's not openly profeſſing it to Worldly Intereſt. ‡ *The honourable Character of a Biſhop is not exchang'd without great Reluctance*, &c. *And the Revenues annex'd to it are a moſt powerful Perſuaſive againſt Popery on this Side of the Seas.* As if it were not eaſy for ſo great a Man as Biſhop *Pearſon*, had he a Mind to turn Papiſt, to have a much better Biſhoprick on the *other Side* of the Seas, than That of *Cheſter*; or than almoſt *any* Biſhoprick Here. *Where the Biſhop's Lady* (continues He, making another ſhrewd Gibe upon the Clergy's Marriage) *with her dear Children, taſte the Sweets of the eaſy Income of her Spiritual Lord; and em-*

‡ P. 71.

ploys

ploys her beſt Rhetorick to convince his Lord-ſhip that State and Plenty are much prettier Things than Evangelical Poverty. Which alone ſuffices to ſtifle the beſt Thoughts, and render the beſt Diſpoſitions towards a Change ineffectual. For a Papiſt to talk ſo gravely of *Evangelical Poverty*, when all the World knows the Prodigious Wealth of Their Clergy, and the Poverty of Ours, is ſomewhat particular. For the reſt, I think it is a Proof of Lenity and Forbearance at leaſt, in Proteſtant Biſhops, that They ſuffer ſuch Inſolence as This, from Perſons who are every day obnoxious to the Penalties of the Law.

5thly. Whereas This Writer adds that the Spiritual Supremacy was ſettled on Q. *Elizabeth* not only without, but ‡ *in direct Oppoſition to the Judgment of the whole Body of the* Engliſh *Clergy*; becauſe † *the Convocation put forth* 5 *Articles*, &c. concerning the *real Preſence*; *Tranſubſtantiation*, and the *Maſs*; the *Pope's Supremacy*; and the *Incapacity of Laymen* to intermeddle in *Affairs of the Church*: I anſwer, 1ſt. He quotes no Authority for This, but *Fuller*'s; which is very indifferent Authority. 2dly. Not only the Civil Power, but any private Perſon, of Learning enough to

‡ P. 257. † P. 256.

un-

underſtand the Points in Queſtion, had a Right, even in Oppoſition to the whole Church, to reject ſuch groſs notorious Falſhoods, and Contradictions to Reaſon, Scripture, and Antiquity, as Tranſubſtantiation, and St. *Peter's* and the Pope's Supremacy. And the Convocation (ſuppoſing the Fact to be true) by determining that † *the Authority of treating and defining Matters relating to Faith, Sacraments, and Church Diſcipline, belong'd only to the Paſtors of the Church, and not to Laymen*, meaning thereby to exclude the Civil Magiſtrate's Authority in the external Regimen of the Church, were Judges in their own Cauſe; and their Judgment was not true, as I have prov'd. His Aſſertion that this was a Matter *purely Spiritual* ‡ I have alſo ſhewn to be falſe. 6thly. That which is here objected was, at Worſt, but a Corruption, an Encroachment, an Irregularity; The moſt They can infer from it is, the Nullity of This Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy in the Church; not the Nullity of the Reformation. It does not, as he imagines it does, unchurch us, or vacate the Orders of our Biſhops and Clergy: Our Reformation, as I obſerv'd, being not built upon the Supremacy he ſpeaks of, tho' That led the

† *Ibid.* ‡ P. 257.

Way

Way to it; but *upon the Foundation of the Apoſtles, and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief Corner-Stone.* And as for the *Authority* by which it was made; it was, as We have ſeen, the joint Authority of Church and State; whatever becomes of the Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy. Not but that there is, and muſt be, ſuch a Supremacy in the Crown, as We aſſert, and have proved, and They will never by any Arguments be able to invalidate.

† *I conclude*, ſays He, *with this Dilemma: to wit Epiſcopal Government either is eſſential to the Conſtitution of Chriſt's Church, or it is Not.* Suppoſe we take the Former Part, and ſay it *is*; Let us ſee how this Horn will puſh us. ‡ *If it be; the preſent reform'd Church of* England *has an eſſential Defect in its very Foundation, I mean the Supreme Spiritual Authority of a Lay-Head.* One would think You ſhould have meant the Want of Epiſcopal Government in the preſent reform'd Church of *England*; for to mean any thing elſe is to mean moſt illogically, and ridiculouſly. And is there not Epiſcopal Government in the preſent reform'd Church of *England*? Beſides; Is not the *Supreme Spiritual Authority of a Lay-Head* a ſtrange kind of *Defect*? You will ſay, I know, that You *mean* (but I had rather you would ſpeak Senſe in

† *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

the

the very Letter, and ſpeak accurately, eſpecially in *Dilemmas*) that the Supreme Spiritual Authority of the Lay-Head deſtroys Epiſcopal Government. But why do not You *prove* This? Or rather how is it poſſible to be prov'd? For will you argue againſt Fact? *Is* there not, I ask once more, Epiſcopal Government in the Church of *England*? And does not all the World *know it*? If You reply, there is indeed the *Name* of it, but its *Force*, *Vertue*, or *Power*, is evacuated by the Supremacy aforſaid; I anſwer, I have proved the Contrary; and fully ſhewn that ſuch an Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy in the Crown as We maintain, and according to the Senſe in which our Laws and Practiſe explain it, is entirely conſiſtent with Epiſcopal Juriſdiction, and Authority, both outward, and inward, both Political, and purely Spiritual. * *Which alſo* [the Supreme Spiritual Authority of a Lay-Head] *it derives wholly and ſolely from the ſecular Power, without the leaſt Concurrence or Approbation of the Epiſcopal Authority, as has been fully proved.* And I ſay I have fully anſwered all This: Which is Here Anſwer ſufficient. Tho' I am not oblig'd to meddle with the other Branch of his Dilemma, having already made my Option; yet *ex abundanti*, and

* *Ibid.*

for

for Curiosity's sake, We will examine That too. * *But if Episcopal Government be not essential,* &c. *and may be either set up, or laid aside, like ordinary human Institutions* ——*then the Presbyterians* &c. *have as fair a Title to be a Part of Christ's true Church, as the Church of* England *can pretend to.* He might have gone on in This Declamation for fifty Pages more, if he had pleased; but who among Us sets aside Episcopal Authority? † *For if Episcopal Authority may be set aside at one time, I see no Reason why it may not be cast off for good and all.* Nor I neither; if by *set aside* he means *lawfully* set aside: But who affirms that it may at *any time* be so? Why, in the next Words he *seems* to argue that *We* do. ‖ *And if the secular Power may legally new model the Hierarchy so as to constitute a Lay-Head over the Church, and even that independently of the Episcopal Authority; I am not sharp-sighted enough to see any solid Reason why the same Power may not as legally commit forever the whole Government of it to such Persons as it thinks fitting; whether they be Lay-Ministers made so by Lay-Ordination, or of That Rank whom the Church of* England *calls Bishops.* I tell him again, the secu-

* *Ibid.* and *P.* 258. † *P.* 258. ‖ *Ibid.*

lar

lar Power did *not* new model the Hierarchy; nor is it in *England* new model'd at all. *Thoſe whom the Church of* England *calls Biſhops.* Why *are they not* Biſhops? If he ſays, No; let him anſwer *Maſon*, *Bramhall*, and the late *French* Author of his own Church and Religion, who have *demonſtrated* the Contrary. If he dares not ſay ſo; what does That paltry Flirt ſignify? * *Nay, I don't ſee why the ſecular Power, when their Hands were in, might not have gone through ſtitch, and declar'd Q.* Elizabeth *in expreſs Terms univerſal Patriarch, as well as Supreme Head of the Church of* England. *For the one is no more than the other contrary to the expreſs Inſtitution of Chriſt.* Where have you prov'd it contrary to the expreſs Inſtitution of Chriſt that Sovereign Princes in their own Dominions ſhould have ſuch a Power in Church-Matters, as We aſſert? You have no where prov'd it, and never can; but have only miſtaken the Queſtion, and moſt abſurdly confounded one thing with another. Or if You think You can prove it, begin as ſoon as you pleaſe; and I undertake to anſwer You.

Nor could the Parliament as well have declared the Queen *Univerſal Patriarch*, as

* Ibid.

Supreme Head (*Governour*, He should have said) of the Church of *England*: Because the One is *false*, as Everybody acknowledges; the other is *true*, as I have shewn.

And thus much for *Convocations*, and *Parliaments*. If the *Vicargeneralship* of *Cromwell* in K. *Henry* the Eighth's Time, or rather his being *Lord Vicegerent* in Ecclesiastical Matters, was not very *decent*; what is it to Us? K. *Henry* VIII. and *Cromwell* too were Papists. Not that it was so portentous and *unheard of* a Thing, as the Bishop of *Meaux*, * nor so *absurd*, and ridiculous, as our Author † represents it. So far otherwise; that it may not only be *excus'd*, but *justify'd*. Let us hear Dr. *Heylin* once more. " ‡ That which is most insisted on " is the delegating of This Power by K. " *Henry* to Sir *Thomas Cromwell*, &c. And " This, (especially his presiding in the Con- " vocation) is look'd upon both by *Sanders* " and some Protestant Doctors as a Kind " of Monstrosity in Nature. But certainly " Those Men forget (tho' I do not think " myself bound to justify all K. *Harry*'s Acti- " ons) that in the Council of *Chalcedon* the " Emperor appointed certain Noblemen " to sit as Judges, whose Names occur in

---

* Pref. P. 11. † P. 192. ‡ Ref. Just. P. 42. 43.

" the

" the firſt Action of That Council. The " like we find exemplified in the *Epheſine* " Council, in which by the Appointment " of *Theodoſius*, and *Valentinian*, the *Ro-* " *man* Emperors, *Candidianus*, a Count " Imperial ſate as Judge, or Preſident; who " in the Management of That Truſt over- " acted any thing that *Cromwell* did, *&c.* But This Office of Vicegerent in Spirituals, * our Author tells us, *was certainly an Eccleſiaſtical Dignity.* Juſt as much ſo as the King's Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy, from which it was deriv'd: And That we have abundantly conſider'd. Neither is there a jot more of Abſurdity in the One, than in the Other. If a Layman can be Supreme in Church-Matters; he may certainly have a Lay-Deputy, or Vicar, in them. Yet our Author is ſo facetious upon This ſuppoſed Incongruity; that I cannot forbear tranſcribing ſome of his Words. † *And who do You think was the Perſon he pitch'd upon for this eminent Station?*

G. *That's more than I can gueſs. But according to my weak Apprehenſion I conceive it to be moſt probable, that it was either the Archbiſhop of* Canterbury, *who is Primate of* England; *or at leaſt ſome other eminent Biſhop.*

---

* P. 192.

P. *Indeed, Sir, You are very much out of the way in your Gueſs. It was one* Thomas Cromwell, *a Layman, and the Son of a Blackſmith.*

G. *I ſhould as ſoon have gueſs'd that he had made a Corn-cutter his prime Miniſter of State; or his Coachman high Admiral of* England.

He need not have quoted Sir *Richard Baker*, back'd by the Authority of my Lord *Herbert*, for the Truth of the Fact. All the World acknowledges it: And This Writer's ſharp Reflections upon it may receive a full Anſwer from what has been ſaid: Except That Circumſtance of *Cromwell*'s being the Son of a Blackſmith; Which I wholly give up, and leave our Author to triumph in, as much as He pleaſes. I only make two ſhort Obſervations. 1ſt. That he is rude in calling him ONE *Thomas Cromwell*; when (notwithſtanding his mean Birth, which was rather an Honour, than a Diſgrace to him) he was Earl of *Eſſex*, and Knight of the Garter. 2dly. That ſince the King thought fit to appoint ſuch an Officer, for which I think there was no Occaſion, and which had better have been let alone; it was more proper to appoint a Layman than a Clergyman: Becauſe the King, who was repreſented by Him, was a Layman Himſelf; And the

the Eccleſiaſtical Authority belonging to the Clergy is of a *different Nature* from That which belongs to the King.

Nor are we in the leaſt concern'd to vindicate *Cromwell*, or Thoſe who acted under him, in the *Execution* of their Office, in their † *Viſitations*, &c. any more than we are to vindicate every thing K. *Henry* did. Let them ſtand, or fall by their own Management; We have nothing to do with it.

As little are we concern'd in the *Commiſſions* from the Crown given to, and accepted of, by the Biſhops, and *revocable at Pleaſure*, in the Reign of *Henry* VIII. and *Edward* VI. ſo much inveigh'd againſt by our Author, and the Biſhop of *Meaux*. They were undoubtedly ſcandalous enough; but *Bonner* condeſcended to take one of them, as well as *Cranmer*. Not that even Theſe were ſo *very wicked*, as all the Papiſts, and ſome Proteſtants make them. If it be ſaid, that at This rate it is in the Power of the Civil Magiſtrate to deſtroy the Church, by abſolutely revoking ſuch Commiſſions, and never granting new ones; I anſwer, That does not follow; becauſe the Biſhops and Clergy have Authority to act without them.

† P. 193.

They might always have acted without them, if they would: And their having accepted of them does not cancel the Authority which they received from Chriſt. While the Church and State are in Accord with each other, and the Former is protected and encourag'd by the Latter; the Church may yield ſomething to the State, without annulling its own Charter and Conſtitution. But in the Caſe now ſuppoſed, the State would perſecute the Church; and ſo the Laſt-mention'd would be neceſſitated to exert it's original Right of acting independent on the State. The *Eccleſiaſtical Power* aſcrib'd to the *Crown* in theſe Commiſſions has been elſewhere ſufficiently conſidered. The Expreſſion is indeed ſtretch'd too far, and by no means proper; but I have ſhewn that it does not, cannot, imply ſo much as the *Papiſts*, and ſome *Proteſtants* too, pretend.

Since our Author has upon This Occaſion, given us a long, and pompous Quotation from Mr. *Collier*; I ſhall conſider ſo much of it as is material to our Purpoſe. * " And after the King has thus declar'd " himſelf *Patriarch* in his Dominions, " claim'd all manner of *Spiritual* Autho- " rity, and pronounc'd the Biſhops his De-

* P. 218.

" legates

" legates at Pleaſure" —— How did the King declare himſelf Patriarch in his Dominions? In expreſs Words? There is no ſuch Word in the Commiſſion he refers to. In Effect, or by Conſequence? I have ſhewn the Contrary. That Expreſſion *all manner of Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction and Authority* has likewiſe been fully diſcuſs'd. Then again, how does the King pronounce the Biſhops his Delegates at pleaſure? *Pronouncing*, one would think, ſhould be in plain Words; For to *pronounce* by *Conſequence* is very odd; eſpecially in Things of ſo ſolemn a Nature, as Commiſſions, and other legal Acts, or Inſtruments. Nor does he ſo much as by conſequence pronounce them his Delegates at pleaſure, in the Commiſſion as here cited; but only aſſerts an Authority in Himſelf to reſtrain the actual Exerciſe of the external Part of their Juriſdiction. " * After This, continues " He, theſe Words are thrown into the " Commiſſion to give it the more paſſable " Complexion; *beſides Thoſe things which* " *are known from holy Scripture to be-* " *long to you by Divine Right.* Now, with " Submiſſion, this Clauſe ſeems to come in " too late; and is utterly inconſiſtent with " the former Part of the Commiſſion." Now

* Ibid.

to my Apprehension, it is very material; and not merely *thrown in*, to give, *&c.* It does not come in too late; is entirely consistent with the former Part of the Commission; and clearly asserts an Authority in the Bishops deriv'd from Christ, and independent of the Civil State. Let us see how the Contrary is prov'd. * "For if the "King is the *Fountain*, &c. then without "question the Hierarchy can have no Ju- "risdiction assign'd in the New Testament, "nor any Authority deriv'd from our Savi- "our. But if the Church is a distinct, *&c.* "then —— Those who suggested the "Draught of this Instrument were No great "Divines." The Fallacy of all This Reasoning will be shewn by remarking upon the material Clauses in it, which, to prevent Repetition, I have not yet cited; and referring to what has been already said. By *all manner of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, as ascrib'd to the Crown, is meant only all manner of *external*, and *political* Jurisdiction in Ecclesiastical Affairs. It is not pretended in the Commission that "the "King's † Lay-Vicegerent might lawfully "supply the Room of all the Bishops in "*England*," nor of *any* Bishop in *England*, totally, and entirely, but only in

* *P.* 219. † *Ibid.*

some

ſome things, as Before; and not one of them *purely Spiritual.* It is not ſaid, nor ſo much as hinted, that † "the Biſhops in the Exe-"cution of their Office are only the King's "Repreſentatives; nor that they are re-vocable at pleaſure;" but only as above. Nor were the Powers which the King claim'd in pure Spirituals; and therefore it is not to the Purpoſe to argue, that ‡ "the Church in *pure Spirituals* is inde-"pendent on all the Kings of the Earth."

But after all; what if the State did really, and very greatly encroach upon the Church? Did That, as I have before argued upon a-nother Occaſion, annul the Church, or vacate the Orders of the Biſhops and Clergy? Suppoſe the Church ſhould encroach upon the State, as we ſay the Church of *Rome* does; That would not deſtroy the King's exe-cutive Authority, nor His, and the Parlia-ment's legiſlative. Beſides; The Pope en-croach'd upon the Rights of the Church, much more than any of our Princes and their Parlia-ments ever did: And the Biſhops much more gave up their Rights by *ſubmitting* to *Him*, than ever they did by *ſubmitting* to any *King*; even, tho' They took Commiſſions from the Latter revocable at Pleaſure.

---

† *Ibid.*

In

In a Word; that there were irregular things done at the Infancy of the Reformation, is granted: But what then? Nay, what if *Henry* VIII. and the Protector in *Edward* VI's time ſtretch'd their Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction even farther than was intended by ſome Laws; which Laws themſelves were too far ſtretch'd? And what if all This was for a Time ſubmitted to? The whole Nation, both Clergy, and Laity, were in Hurry and Uncertainty; and did not well know where they were, nor how they were to act: As it always happens in *great Changes*, tho' never ſo *good*, and *neceſſary*, whether in Church, or State, or Both. But in a little time, much leſs than could reaſonably have been expected, the Church of *England* was *truly* reform'd, and that by *legal Authority*: Nor have our Adverſaries any thing but *Fallacies* in *Reaſoning*, and *Falſhoods* in *Fact*, to alledge againſt *Either*.

The Sum of what has been diſcourſed under This Head (that we may here obſerve the ſame Method as before) is reducible to the following Particulars. 1ſt. Many of the Things objected were done by Papiſts. As declaring the King's Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy; The Submiſſion of the Clergy, *Cromwell's* Vicegerency in Spirituals, *&c.* 2dly. What even *They* did was juſtifiable in the Main; particularly the King's Supremacy, as then

then declared, was no Innovation; whereas That of the Pope is a real one. 3dly, That there was ſome Irregularity and Corruption at the Beginning of the Reformation, is true; but That is no Argument againſt it as it now ſtands. 4thly, It is falſe, That even in K. *Henry*'s and K. *Edward*'s Reigns, the State encroach'd *ſo much* upon the Church, as our Adverſaries pretend. 5thly, Were all they ſay really true, thoſe Irregularities, and Corruptions could not *Unchurch* us, or vacate our Orders. 6thly, In a little time all thoſe Diſorders were regulated; I mean in the Beginning of Q. *Elizabeth*'s Reign: The Reform'd Church of *England* was Then ſettled as it Now ſtands; and that by the joint Authority of Church, and State. Laſtly, Much of what the Romaniſts object to Us may be retorted upon Themſelves; and ſome of it with great Advantage. For inſtance, *Their* Parliaments have meddled in Religious and Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, as much as *Ours*; particularly in Q. *Mary*'s time: Q. *Mary* gave Inſtructions to her Biſhops about Religion, as K. *Edward* did to His: She, as well as Q. *Elizabeth*, depriv'd Biſhops by her own regal Authority. And more Force and Violence, upon the Account of Religion, was made uſe of by Her, during a Reign of five Years only, than by all the Proteſtant Kings, and Queens, from the Beginning of the Reformation to this very Day.

A N

AN

ANSWER

TO A

Popiſh BOOK,

ENTITLED,

ENGLAND's *Converſion and Reformation compar'd*, &c.

To the Fourth DIALOGUE.

AS This Dialogue is the ſhorteſt of the Four; ſo it might very well have been much ſhorter than it is. For there is little in it, beſides *Repetition*. Which indeed the very Title of it imports. *A Compariſon between the moſt remarkable Circumſtances of* England's *Converſion on the one hand, and it's pretended Reformation*

on

on the other. That is, in effect, the *General Title* of his Book; England's *Converſion, and Reformation compar'd:* What has he been doing all this while, eſpecially in the 2d and 3d Dialogues, but making ſuch a Compariſon? It may peradventure be reply'd, that he has hitherto laid down the Means, and Methods of the Converſion on the one ſide, and the Reformation on the other, ſeparately, and diſtinctly; but now he brings them cloſe together; ſets them in Contraſte, as Oppoſites; and more particularly and briefly, compares them with each other. But tho' this was not neceſſary, even This he has done already: I mean in the laſt Section of his Second Dialogue, to my Remarks upon which I refer the Reader, deſiring him to review them before he proceeds: Becauſe That will ſave Me, and Him too, a great deal of Trouble. If our Author even There be Tautological, as He really is; He is much more ſo Here; by *repeating* what he has there *repeated.* It is true, He here pretends to give his Pupil * *a Lecture upon the Uſe, and Application that is to be made of the Collection of Facts he has hitherto entertain'd him with.* This Uſe, or Application, one would imagine, ſhould be drawing *Inferences*, or *Corollaries* not yet mention'd: Whereas 'tis nothing but a nauſeous Repetition of Thoſe Facts, moſt of them falſe;

* P. 274.

and

and of his own falſe Reaſonings from them all. Every Tittle of this therefore I have anſwer'd already; moſt of it over and over: And nothing ſhall provoke me to any more Repetition; at leaſt if it be poſſible to avoid it: For ſometimes, I doubt, it will Not. Whatever I meet with that *looks* like ſomething yet unanſwer'd, ſhall not fail to have ample Juſtice done it.

To the Firſt, Second, and Third Sections.

THE very Titles of theſe Sections, as well as That of the Dialogue in general, ſhew the Truth of what I have ſaid. Sect. I. *The reſpective Qualifications of the chief Inſtruments of* England's *Converſion and Reformation compar'd.* Sect. II. *The Methods and Means of* England's *Converſion, and Reformation compar'd.* Sect. III. *The Motives of* England's *Converſion, and Reformation compar'd.* Have we not had enough of all this long ago? Why muſt we again be baited with the old Story of St. *Auſtin*, *Gregory*, &c. on the one hand; of *Henry* VIII. the Duke of *Somerſet*, Q. *Elizabeth*, &c. on the other? And that too without the leaſt Variety in the Air, and Manner; without any Reinforcement of the Argument; or ſetting it in any new Light whatſoever? I have ſufficiently expos'd the Falſhood of his Hiſtory, and the Abſurdity, or Impertinence of his Arguments, in my Examina-

Examination of his 2d. and 3d. Dialogues: Why ſhould my Reader, and I be teiz'd with the ſame *Stuff* over again? I appeal to Every one, of what Perſuaſion ſoever, who has our Author's Book in his hands, even to it's Author himſelf, whether what I ſay of his *Crambe* be not litterally, and ſtrictly true: And whether I can be juſtly charged with leaving one Word in his Book unanſwer'd; tho' I paſs by many Pages together, without taking the leaſt Notice of them. All I have to do therefore in this Diviſion (as Before in ſeveral others) is to remark upon here, and there, a particular Stroke, which we have not yet met with.

Before He comes to his Repetitions laid down in Theſe *three*, and the remaining *two* Sections, under *nine* diſtinct Heads; as formally as if he had hitherto left thoſe Matters *untouch'd:* He no leſs *ſolemnly* premiſes *ſix general Maxims*, as he calls them; which he *thinks are inconteſtable.* * His *Firſt*, that *the Converſion of a Kingdom to the True Faith is the Work of God*, &c. is true, in ſome Senſe, or other; but nothing to the Purpoſe. His *Second*, concerning the *Perſonal Characters* of *Converts* and *Reformers* may receive Anſwer enough from what I have diſcours'd. The *Third*, that a *Change* from one *Religion* to ano-

* P. 275, &c.

ther

ther is a great *Bleſſing*, or a great *Curſe*, is profoundly wiſe; and I need ſay no more of it. The *fourth* is, That "the common People, "and Perſons of no Learning, who have "neither Capacity, nor Leiſure, to examine "every controverted Point of Religion by "it ſelf, muſt have recourſe to certain ex-"ternal Marks to judge by in the Caſe of "a national Change from one Religion to a-"nother, whether it be a Change from Truth "to Falſhood, or from Falſhood to Truth; "and by conſequence whether God, or the "Devil be the principal Author of it." I anſwer 1ſt. The common People have Capacity to *know*, at leaſt to be *inſtructed in*, all the plain neceſſary Points of Religion: And tho' they have not Capacity to examine all controverted Points, and there are many which it is not fit they ſhould examine, or meddle with; yet they may very well judge of Points which nothing but the *Height of Impudence* could have *made controverted* ones: A *Child*, that can *read the Bible*, may know that *Popery is falſe*. 2dly, The *external Marks* he refers to, are a thouſand *times more difficult*, and *leſs intelligible* to the *unlearned*, than the *internal* ones; or than the thing of which they are pretended to be Marks: As I have above obſerv'd. [See *p.* 187.] But in this Paſſage our Author ſpoke the very Heart and Soul of a *Popiſh Prieſt*: The *Common People* (whom 'tis his Buſineſs

to *ſeduce*) have not Learning and Capacity to judge of *Doctrines*, but they may eaſily judge of plain *outward Facts*: That is, they may be made to ſtare, and be aſtoniſh'd, at a Story about the wicked Lives of *Harry* VIII. and the Duke of *Somerſet*; about Q. *Elizabeth*, and *Mary*, Q. *Scots* &c. They may have their Heads turn'd with a Clatter of Words about *Antiquity*, *Catholicity*, the *Church*, the *Principle of Unity*, and ſuch like, which they underſtand juſt as much of as they do of *Greek* and *Hebrew*; and all this, in order to *hinder* and *divert* them from *making uſe* of the common Senſe and Reaſon which God has given them: Which will preſently tell them that a Religion which, in the *plaineſt Caſes*, contradicts the Word of God, Reaſon, and our Senſes, as *Popery* does, cannot be true. The *fifth* is, That *the good or bad Characters of the chief Actors in it*, &c. *are external Marks on which a ſolid Judgement may be grounded*, &c. But internal ones are much better, and ſurer; and thoſe *external ones* are very fallacious, as I have ſhewn. One of the Marks laid down by *Bellarmine* himſelf (tho' he makes a ſtrange uſe of it) is *Sanctity of Doctrine*: yet our Author takes no notice of That. To which we may very well add, that the *external Marks* He *here* mentions are none of the *three* which he laid down *at firſt*; I mean in his ſecond Dialogue *p.* 78, 79. Of which I have ſaid

ſome-

ſomething already, and of which more hereafter The *ſixth* Maxim is, *That if the Converſion of* England *from Paganiſm to the Roman Catholick Faith* (for ſo he *will* have it, tho' nothing, as I have demonſtrated, can be more falſe) *has the external Marks of an extraordinary Mercy on it's Side*, [he might have added, and the *internal* too, had he meant, as he ought to have meant, that *England* was converted to *Chriſtianity*, not to *Popery*] *and the Reformation of that Faith has on the contrary all thoſe external Marks againſt it* [add, tho' *all internal* ones *for* it] *then an unbiaſs'd Perſon*, &c. I have abundantly ſhewn the Falſhood of the Facts here ſuppos'd to be true; and the Falſhood of the Conſequences drawn from them, even if they had been true.

P. 279. *But Proteſtants will ſay that the Parliament took away all Defects by inveſting them* [i. e. the Layman *Henry* VIII. the Child *Edward* VI, and the Woman Queen *Elizabeth*] *with the ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical Authority.* No, but they will not: The Crown, whoever wears it, has ſuch an Authority inherent in it.

He aſſerts * that *Proteſtants run down all Miracles as pious Frauds.* This is of a piece with what he ſays P. 181. *I preſume that*

* P. 290.

Proteſtant Biſhops will nor allow of Miracles. Was there ever ſuch Folly, and Inſolence? Becauſe we deny *Popiſh* Miracles, which are falſe and ſpurious; therefore we muſt deny *all* Miracles, even thoſe of *Moſes* and the Prophets, Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, which are true and genuine. Becauſe we will not be *Papiſts*, we *muſt* be Infidels. He and his young Gentleman continue their Boaſts of Miracles in the Church of *Rome*: * And I inſiſt, that We work as many as They. If they have That Power; why do they not ſhew it among us Hereticks, and work Miracles to convert us? To his whole Argument drawn from our Want of Miracles at the Reformation, I anſwer; there was *no Occaſion* for them: Nor would there have been any, had the Reformation, as he falſly aſſerts it did, oppos'd the whole Chriſtian World. For it did not introduce a new Religion, but re-eſtabliſh an old one. The Goſpel was in Being; That the Scripture was the Word of God, was granted by All: They had therefore nothing to do, but to obey the Voice of Reaſon, ſpeaking like That which St. *Auguſtine* heard at his Converſion, *Tolle, Lege*; Take up the Book, and read. *Reading*, and plain *common Senſe*, were ſufficient; without freſh Miracles. Theſe general, and moſt

* *P.* 290, 291.

true

true Obſervations being made; it will be eaſy to unravel all our Author's particular Sophiſms. * *In the Concurrence of two contradictory Doctrines, if one of them has the Evidence of Miracles on its Side, the other is manifeſtly convicted of Falſhood.* 1ſt. *Their* Doctrines have no ſuch Evidence, any more than *Ours*. 2dly, Miracles *alone* are not ſufficient Evidence. See *Deuteron.* xiii. 1, 2, 3. Nay the true Doctrine may want them, and the falſe have them. The *Nature of the Doctrine* muſt be conſidered, in Conjunction with the Miracles. † *This*, viz, a Caſe in which Miracles are requir'd, *was the Caſe of Moſes*, &c. That was to atteſt a *new Revelation:* We do not pretend to any. When therefore we were delivered from our worſe than *Egyptian* Bondage; there was no need of a *Moſes* to work Miracles. ‖ *This was likewiſe the Caſe of the Apoſtles.* I anſwer, as above: The Apoſtles introduced a *new* Religion; and it was neceſſary that Chriſtianity ſhould *originally* be eſtabliſh'd by Miracles. ‡ *Now I dare boldly ſay there was ſcarce ever a religious Cauſe that ſtood more in need of Miracles to prove that it was the Cauſe of God, than that of the pretended Reformation.* Why? Becauſe the Reformers *oppos'd* the *whole* Chriſtian Church in all Ages, con-

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‖ *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

sequently ‖ *pretended to new Revelations*; and so on to the End of the Paragraph: Every Word of which I have here, and elsewhere, prov'd to be false. † *If the Protestant Doctrine, as far as it is opposite to Popery, be a reveal'd Doctrine (for otherwise God has no Share in it) the first Teachers of it, to whom we must suppose it was reveal'd, were bound to prove the Revelation of it, by the Testimony of uncontested Miracles.* This is palpably colluſive. The Protestant Doctrine is an *old reveal'd* Doctrine, (and so *God has a Share* in it) *not newly reveal'd* to the Reformers, nor pretended to be so. The *first Teachers* of it, who were Christ and his Apostles, not the *Reformers*, DID *prove*, the Revelation of it by *Miracles*; and That was sufficient.

His Saying *p.* 296. that the Duke of *Somerset* was a *Zuinglian*, who at *p.* 176, was a *rank Calvinist*, is a Trifle not worth our Notice. And his affirming that in K. *Edward's* Time *all the Cathedrals, Parish-Churches, and Chapels in the Kingdom were strip'd as naked as Quaker's Meeting-Houses, so that nothing but the bare Walls were left standing*, is a notorious Falshood; but That too, among so many others of far greater Moment, may well pass for a Trifle.

‖ *P.* 292. † *P.* 293.

P. 301. *But I cannot believe that Chriſt was in the midſt of them*, [the Reformers:] *or that they could ſay with the Apoſtles at the Council of* Jeruſalem, it has ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, and to Us, *&c. Acts* 15. *v.* 28. I anſwer, 1ſt. The Holy Ghoſt was in the midſt of them, tho' not by Inſpiration, when they did well; not when they did ill. 2dly, Tho' the Apoſtles themſelves were inſpir'd Perſons, yet they were not ſo in all things. 3dly, Therefore the beſt Senſe of Thoſe Words *it ſeemed good*, &c. appears to be, not that they related to the Holy Ghoſt's preſiding in the Council at *Jeruſalem*, tho' he might, and did preſide There, and that in all likelyhood after an extraordinary manner; but to the Holy Ghoſt's being given to the *Gentiles*, as well as to the *Jews*. See *v.* 8, 9. Which *putting no difference between them*, was a Teſtimony given by the Holy Ghoſt, that the Yoke of the Jewiſh Ceremonies was not to be impos'd upon the Gentile. And it having thus appear'd to have *ſeem'd good to the Holy Ghoſt*; it therefore *ſeem'd good to the Apoſtles* likewiſe. So that our Author's bringing in That Text, to leſſen and vilify the Reformers, was upon all Accounts extremely idle.

P. 302. *Biſhop* Burnet *acquaints us that Q.* Elizabeth *ſcrupled at firſt very much to accept the Supremacy.* He does not ſay ſo. He only ſays ſhe did not like the *Title of*

Supreme Head. † *And well she might* (continues our Author) *for she could not but know herself unqualify'd by her very Sex*, &c. This was not the Reason; Bishop *Burnet* gives us a very different one: His Words are These. * Nor did she like the Title of Supreme Head. She thought it imported too "great Power, and came too near the Authority which Christ only had over the "Church.

† Ibid. * Hist Ref. Vol. 2. P. 376.

To the Fourth SECTION:

ENTITULED,

The Unity of Faith on the one side compar'd with the Disagreements on the other.

SOMETHING has been said of This above; in our Examination of Sect. 7. Dialogue I. * A great Part of what our Author both Here, and There, insists upon, is not much to his Purpose. His Book, as

---

* See P. 158, 159.

its

its Title ſets forth, is written againſt the Church of *England*: And the Church of *England* is not obliged to vindicate all the Reformers and Proteſtants of *Chriſtendom*, in every thing they did, or do. Whatever therefore were the Differences between † *Luther*, *Carolſtadius*, *Oecolampadius*, *Zuinglius*, and *Calvin*; I know not how We came to be concern'd with them. Not but that it is utterly falſe to ſay, as He does, that they *fell into the utmoſt Confuſion, and Variance, like the Builders of Babel*: They differ'd in ſome Things, it is true; and they were *but Men*. But are there not many Sects, and Diviſions, among the Papiſts? 'Tis known there are; as many as among all Denominations of Proteſtants put together. Our Author therefore has little Reaſon, both Here, and in the other Part of his Book juſt now mention'd, to be ſo witty and triumphant upon This Subject, and another which he joins with it, and which is indeed nearly ally'd to it, the Abuſe of the Scriptures by ſome Men's diſtorting them to their own pre-conceiv'd Opinions. ‡ *Thus Martin Luther* (ſays He) *Carolſtadius*, &c. *found it plain in Scripture that ſolemn Vows*, &c. to the End of the Paragraph. I anſwer 1ſt, The Errors he mentions are not worſe

† P. 305. ‡ P. 54, 55.

than

than those of Popery. 2dly, They are only the Opinions of private Persons; but those which We call Popish are the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*. 3dly, It does not follow that because the Scriptures may be *abus'd*, therefore they are not fit to be *us'd*. He continues. * *Thus finally the Scriptures, as manag'd by the Reform'd Churches, are plain and positive for* Lutheranism *in* Germany, *for* Calvinism *at* Geneva, *&c.* It may be so; but they are *against Popery* in *all Countries*; and that not as they are *manag'd*, &c. but *really*, and in *themselves*. Nor are they wrested, and tortured by any Set of Men upon Earth, more than by Papists. Thus again: † Luther *found his Doctrine plainly in Scripture, and so did* Calvin *his*, &c. —— *Nay no one found his Doctrine more clearly in Scripture, than honest* James Naylor; *as his whole Crew of Quakers do at this very day.* I will add one Sect more, and That is the *Papists:* Who *pretend* to find *their* Doctrines in Scripture, and that with as *little Ground* as any Sect in *Christendom*; who, after all This Clutter too, make use of their own *private Judgment* in reading the Scriptures, and put others upon doing the same: Else what do they mean by *arguing with us* from *Scripture?*

* P. 56. † P. 309, 310.

But

But to put it at the Worſt, 'tis much better to be *in Danger* of making an *ill uſe* of our *Eyes*, than to have *None*; or to be *hinder'd* from *ſeeing* with them: Better there ſhould be a *hundred falſe* Opinions in the World, than *no true* Judgment: Better *differ* among ourſelves about a *thouſand* things, eſpecially if few or none of them be of much *moment*, than all *unite* in Nonſenſe, and Ignorance, Vice, and Villany.

But what is the Drift of our Author's Reaſoning upon this Subject? It amounts to thus much. Becauſe there is a great deal of Error among Proteſtants, therefore the Reformation was unjuſtifiable: Becauſe many pretend falſely that their Opinions are ſupported by Scripture, therefore none pretend it truly. By which way of Arguing, he may as well prove that there is *no Truth* in the *World*, becauſe there *is much Falſehood*. One Inſtance, among many Others, of *the Incurable Scepticiſm of the Church of* Rome. *

He is upon the ſame Argument, in the ſame Gaiety of Heart, *P.* 314. *The* Lutherans, *who led up the Dance, were reform'd by the* Zuinglians, *and They by the* Calviniſts.——What if they were? Is it any juſt Prejudice againſt a Reformation,

† See a Book ſo Entitled. Printed in 1688.

that

that it was not all made *at once?* " *And They* " *again by the Anabaptists.*" To rank *Them* with the *Reformers*, is an Unchristian Calumny. " *And at home K.* Henry's *Reformation was reform'd by K.* Edward, *and his by Q.* Elizabeth." That is, the Reformation was *gradual*, and grew better, and better; as I answer'd Before. " *And has since* " *been reform'd by the Presbyterians, In-* " *dependents, Fanaticks, Quakers, and the* " *Lord knows how many more.*" There are not *many* more; But however, as I just now said of the Anabaptists abroad, 'tis an infamous slander upon the Church of *England* to call These Schismaticks, and Hereticks her Reformers: Nor is Their Schism, or Heresy, any Argument against Her; as I have partly shewn, and partly shall shew in the Sequel.

† His Reflections upon the unsettled State of Things, Variety of Opinions, and Heat of Contention, in K. *Henry's* and K. *Edward's* Reigns, are as little serviceable to his Cause. A Reformation, tho' never so good, cannot be made in a Day; any more than *Rome*, Popish *Rome*, could be built in one. Differences, and Errors too, there will be for a time: But *fine Gold* is never the less fine, because the Parts of it were

---

P. 306.

in

in a *rapid Agitation*, before it became ſo.

‡ His abuſive, and malicious Invectives againſt Thoſe *outlandiſh Adventurers*, as he ſtiles them, who came over into *England* in K. *Edward*'s Reign, are agreeable to the reſt. *John Alaſco*, he tells us, was *a profeſs'd Anabaptiſt*. Sure he miſtakes *John Alaſco* for *John a Leyden*: For I do not find that the Firſt was an *Anabaptiſt*; but I find that he was a Nobleman of great Parts, Learning, Piety, and Wiſdom. His ſaying that *Peter Martyr*, and *Martin Bucer*, were *Apoſtate Prieſts*, is nothing but *calling Names*, and *begging the Queſtion*. What if *Peter Martyr* was a *Zuinglian*, and *Bucer* partly *a Zuinglian*, and partly a *Lutheran*? It does not follow that they *brought over with them different Syſtems of Faith*; as He untruly aſſerts they did. They might differ in *ſome Doctrines*, or in the manner of explaining them; and yet not have different Syſtems of Faith. Tho' if they had; it matters not as to Us, nor in the leaſt impeaches the Faith of the Church of *England*. Neither are the ‖ *Vitals of Chriſtian Religion* half ſo much *devour'd* by all the Schiſms, and Hereſies among Proteſtants, as by the damnable Doctrines of *Popery*, utterly deſtructive of Criſtianity, and even of common Morality.

---

‡ *P.* 307. ‖ 308.

His

His triumphing over the poor Church of *England*, as † *ſcarce keeping upon its Legs* &c. *always complaining of its being in danger from the Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptiſts, Quakers, —Antitrinitarians, Freethinkers*, &c. to whom He might have added *Papiſts*, who find their Account from them all, is not very generous, tho' founded upon too much Truth. Nevertheleſs He may remember that to be malign'd, attack'd, undermin'd, betray'd, ſlander'd and traduced, is no more an Argument againſt any Church, than to be in a State of direct *Perſecution* ſtrictly and properly ſo call'd. It was never the Church of *England*'s way of Reaſoning to eſtimate the Goodneſs or Badneſs of any Cauſe from temporal Proſperity or Adverſity. Yet let not her proud Adverſaries of any Denomination, whether Presbyterians, or Papiſts, whether Enthuſiaſts and Fanaticks on the one hand, or Freethinkers, Infidels, and Atheiſts on the other, let not any of them, or all of them put together, inſult too much over her; However hated, deſpis'd, diſtreſs'd, ſhe may ſometimes be; ſhe can always with humble Confidence uſe the Language of God's Church, as tranſmitted to us by the Prophet *Micah*, *chap.* 7. *v.* 8. *Rejoice not againſt me, O mine Enemy; when I fall, I*

† *Ibid.*

ſhall

ſhall ariſe: When I ſit in Darkneſs, the Lord ſhall be a Light unto me.

By a very natural Tranſition from This, we may well obſerve; that when the Church of *England* could NOT *keep upon her Legs*, when ſhe was in all Appearance, and human Probability, quite deſtroy'd by Presbyterians, and Independents, Hypocrites and Atheiſts; when ſhe ſeem'd to be dead and bury'd beyond Hope of a Reſurrection; when *her Servants* could only *think upon her Stones, and it pity'd them to ſee her in the Duſt*: Even *then* ſome of her faithful Sons and Servants, wandring in Exile, ſeeking their Bread in foreign Countries, gave the Church of *Rome* ſuch Wounds, as by Reaſon and Argument ſhe has never yet been able to heal; nor ever will be to the Day of Judgment. For Proof of This, to omit others, let BRAMHALL only be my Witneſs.

His calling the ſeveral Sects, Schiſms, and Hereſies, which he has mention'd, * *younger Broods of the Reformation*, is a Complication of two Sophiſms; Arguing from what is *accidental*, to what is *eſſential*, and aſſigning That for a *Cauſe*, which is *not* ſo. Our Saviour ſaid he *came not to ſend Peace upon Earth, but Diviſion*: i. e. Diviſion would be the *accidental Conſequence* of his Coming.

---

* *Ibid.*

Will

Will the *Romaniſts* ſay that the one was the *proper genuine Cauſe* of the other? The Caſes are the ſame.

For what our Author aſſerts ‡ here, and in many other Places, *viz.* that the Church of *England* ſeparated from the Church of *Rome* upon the *very ſame Principle*, as our ſeveral *Sectaries* proceed upon in ſeparating from *us*, is altogether groundleſs and unjuſt.

G. "But if it be no Blemiſh to the Church "of *Rome*, that the Reform'd Churches "have ſeparated themſelves from her Com- "munion; why ſhould it be a Blemiſh to "the Reform'd Church of *England*, that "the *Diſſenters* have ſeparated themſelves "from *Her*?

P. "Sir, I perceive you don't apprehend "me right. For I don't pretend that the "Separation of one, or many Sects from "any Church can juſtly caſt a Blemiſh upon "it; unleſs their Separation NATURALLY "flow from a Principle AVOW'D and MAIN- "TAIN'D by *That very Church* from which "they *ſeparate* themſelves. Now this is the "VERY CASE between our *Engliſh Diſſenters*, "and the Church of *England* as Eſtabliſh'd "by Law. Becauſe it is a fundamental "Principle of this Church, that every Man's "only Rule of Faith is the written Word

‡ *P.* 308, 309.

"of

" of God, not as interpreted by the Church, " but as underſtood by Himſelf."

I anſwer, 1ſt. We do not ſay, *not as interpreted by the Church, but as underſtood by Himſelf:* We ſay *both* as interpreted by the Church, *and* underſtood by himſelf. 2dly, Is it a NATURAL Conſequence that becauſe every one's only Rule of Faith is the written Word of God, in reading which he makes uſe of his own Reaſon; THEREFORE People ſhould ſeparate from the Church of *England?* The Word of God, if impartially conſulted, and interpreted according to the Senſe of the Catholick Church, will tell them that they ought *not* to ſeparate from the Church of *England:* But if they will read the Word of God with *Prejudice*, and ſo pervert its Meaning, or not *obey* it, when they rightly underſtand it; This is purely *accidental*, not *natural* or *neceſſary*: And the *Fault* is wholly *their own.* His Queſtion, † *For where will Schiſms ſtop*, &c. has been fully anſwer'd *Sect.* 7. *Dial* I. Nor will *this Principle inſtead of uniting them* NATURALLY *divide them*: 'Tis not the *Principle* that does it; but the *ill Uſe* that's made of it. ‡ *But they* [the ſeveral Sects of Proteſtants, the Church of *England* among the reſt] *all took care it ſhould be Scripture interpre-*

† *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibd*

ted by themselves. So it ought to be, according to the best of their own *sincere* Endeavours to understand it, and the best *Assistance* they could obtain. ‡ *And contrary to the Judgment of that Church, which was the only visible Catholick Church upon Earth before the Reformation.* 1st, It is false that the Church of *Rome* was the only Church. 2dly, According to the excellent Rule of *Vincentius Lirinensis* * if any *novel Contagion* has overspread the *whole Church*; in such a Case *Christianus Catholicus*, the *Catholick Christian*, must not stand to the Award of the *present* Church, but *antiquitati inhærere*; stick to *Antiquity*. This was the Case at the Reformation, upon Supposition that the Church of *Rome* was the only Church: And so the *Reformers*, even upon That Supposition, which is false too, acted like true *Catholick Christians*. But our Author proceeds. *And is it then a Wonder the Dissenters from the Church of* England *should challenge the same Privilege to themselves, and follow the Rule they receiv'd as a Sacred Trust from the very Apostles of the Reformation?* Answ. What *Privilege?* The Privilege of *abusing* a *good Rule?* Do they *follow* it by *abusing* it? And was the *Abuse* of it a *Sacred Trust*, &c? He adds. † *What was maintain'd — by the Heads of the Reformation —*

* Com. I. Chap. 4, 6. † Ibid.

who

who--ſet up the proud Idol of private Judgment, &c. *cannot be juſtly blam'd in Thoſe* [meaning our *Diſſenters*] *who--- guided themſelves by the very Rule, and Principle, they had taught them.* As much as to ſay; Becauſe all Proteſtants agree in Theſe Principles, that Men are to judge for themſelves, and that Scripture only is the Rule of Faith: Therefore the Proteſtant Diſſenters who ſeparate from the Church of *England* CONTRARY to Reaſon and Scripture, act juſt as the firſt Reformers did, who ſeparated from the Church of *Rome* ACCORDING to Reaſon and Scripture. Or, in other Words, Becauſe two Men, alledging the ſame Principle, *pretend* to be in the Right; therefore *Both are* in the Right, or *Neither* is.

† *Let us ſuppoſe a Doctor of the Church of* England *ſhould tell a Diſſenting Miniſter that he ought to ſubmit himſelf to the Judgment and Authority of the Church eſtabliſh'd by Law. The Miniſter would readily anſwer him, that This was ſapping the very Foundation of all the reform'd Churches--- For if there were an Obligation of ſubmitting a Man's private Judgment to any human Authority*, &c. to the End of the Paragraph. All This may receive a full Anſwer from what has been diſcours'd; and is nothing but Quibbling upon two or three Words, or Expreſſions. As 1ſt, *Sub-*

mit to the Judgment, and Authority of the Church——We tell no Diſſenters that they muſt ſubmit to *Our* Church, as Papiſts teach we muſt to *Theirs*. There is, or ought to be, *a* Submiſſion to the Church; but not *ſuch* a one as They require. 2dly, *Provided They* [the Diſſenters] *were but allow'd to be Themſelves the Interpreters of the Word of God.* So they ſhall be, and are allow'd to be, themſelves the Interpreters of it; meaning, They ſhall be allow'd to make Uſe of their own Reaſon, and Judgment, in reading it. But neither They, nor We, nor Anybody elſe, ought to interpret it arbitrarily, and with Prejudice: Nobody ought to put his own forc'd Conſtruction upon the Scriptures, dragging them to his own preconceiv'd Opinions, and reſolving that They ſhall ſpeak *his* Senſe, whether they will, or no. But the *Diſſenting Miniſter*, our Author may object, will ſay, *We* do ſo and *They* do Not: And I anſwer, *Saying* is not *Proving*. If it be ask'd, Who ſhall be Judge? I anſwer, true, right, unprejudiced Reaſon: Which Everybody may have, if he pleaſes; And if he has it not, 'tis his own fault. I hope it does not follow that becauſe a Man *ſays* he is in the Right, therefore he *is* in the Right: If That be the Caſe, we muſt *argue* about Nothing; from *Scripture*, or any thing *elſe*. According to This way of Reaſoning, *Reaſoning* itſelf is Nonſenſe. 3dly, *It was*, He ſays,

ſays, *a fundamental Principle of the Reformation that the Word of God*, as *Interpreted according to every Man's private Conſcience, is the only Rule of his Faith.* The Word of God is *in*, and *of it ſelf*, the *Rule*: As to it's being *interpreted according to every Man's private Conſcience*; If the Man has inform'd his Conſcience, or rather *Judgment*, as well as he is able, Prejudice being ſet aſide, He makes a *good* Uſe of the Rule; otherwiſe, a *bad* one.

* In the next Paragraph he repeats the Words *Quaker*, *Anabaptiſt*, *Socinian*, and *Free-thinker*, which do him wonderful Service; inſiſting that They can all *maintain their Ground* againſt the Church of *England*, upon the Principle we are ſpeaking of: But what I have now ſaid ſhews all This to be *empty Noiſe*; and ſo I leave it.

The Reformation therefore has † not *been by it's very Principles the fruitful Mother of endleſs Diviſions*; but *Popery* by it's *very Principles* has been, and is, the *fruitful Mother* of all Manner of *Wickedneſs*; as I have in This, and Another Treatiſe ſufficiently prov'd.

However, He is ſure ‡ *the Reformation was not the Work of the Holy Ghoſt.* And I have Before anſwer'd, that what was good

---

* *P.* 311. † *Ibid.* ‡ *P.* 112.

in it was the Work of the Holy Ghoſt; what was bad was Not. ‖ *And then*, ſays He, *it is eaſy to gueſs what Spirit preſided in their Councils.* That is, becauſe our Reformers *read the Scriptures*, and aſſerted the Right of *private Judgment*; and upon Thoſe Principles, both They and their Succeſſors were *likely* enough to *differ* among themſelves in *ſome* Things, and actually *did* ſo differ; Therefore the *Devil* preſided in their Councils. Fine Arguing indeed! They agreed in the *Main* of their Doctrine, in the *great Points* of Chriſtianity: And ſo do We; We of the Church of *England* at leaſt: And in many things of leſs moment We may very ſafely differ.

As for the *various Sects* among Proteſtants, the Argument drawn from Them will hold as well againſt *Chriſtianity*, as againſt *Proteſtantiſm*; nay better; For *Chriſtendom* includes *all* Sects of Proteſtants, and Papiſts too: And ſo there are *more* Sects among *Chriſtians* than among *Proteſtants.* And, which more nearly concerns our Author and his Party, it proves as ſtrongly againſt *Them*, as againſt *Us.* † *It could not be the Spirit of Truth, whom Chriſt promis'd to ſend*, &c. To This Text I hope I have ſaid enough under another

---

‖ *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

Article

Article in the Firſt Dialogue. † *For the Spirit of Truth is eſſentially the Spirit of Unity and Concord: And therefore as he cannot contradict himſelf, ſo he cannot be the Author of Contradictions in Thoſe who are guided by him.* 'Tis certain he cannot be the *Author of Contradictions in Thoſe who are guided by him*; nor in any Others: Becauſe he cannot be the Author of Contradictions *at all.* But Thoſe who have the ordinary Guidance of his Grace (for *We* do not pretend to the extraordinary Guidance of Inſpiration) may differ among themſelves in ſome things, *notwithſtanding* That Guidance, tho' not *becauſe* of That Guidance. If Thoſe among whom are *any* Diviſions, have not the Direction of the Holy Spirit; the Church of *Rome* has it not, for the Reaſon juſt mention'd. * *Chriſt pray'd for them that were to be*, &c. that *they might be perfectly one.* John xvii. ver. 23. *And he never pray'd in vain.* Whatever be the Senſe of This Text, the Papiſts are no more *perfectly one* than We are, and ſo can make no more Uſe of This Paſſage. Something might be ſaid too of our Saviour's never *praying in vain*; but as it is not to our Purpoſe, I paſs it by. ‡ *St.* Paul *exhorts the Faithful to be of one Accord, and one*

† *Ibid.* * *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

Mind. Phil. ii. ver. 2. St. *Paul* does not There use the Word *Faithful;* Those who are truly such will of course be of one Mind in the main. But were All whom He *exhorted* to be of one Mind *actually* of one Mind? And did They *cease* to be *Members of the Church,* by *not* being so? He * exhorts the *Corinthians* to be *perfectly join'd together in the same Judgment,* 1 Cor. i. ver. 10. That is, belike, in entirely submitting to the Church of *Rome,* whatever She said: For, according to Her, no other Judgment was allow'd them.

† *Pray tell me, Sir, could the Holy Ghost be the Inspirer of* Lutheranism *in* Saxony, *of* Zuinglianism *in* Switzerland, *of* Calvinism *at* Geneva, *of* Fanaticism *in* Scotland, *and of a Religion different from them all in* England? Not to insist that These are not so *different* from one another, as He is pleas'd to suppose; *Pray, Sir,* says a Heathen, a Mahometan, or a Jew, *could the Holy Ghost be the Inspirer* of *Popery,* and all it's Sects, in *Italy, France, Germany, Spain,* and *Portugal;* of *Protestantism,* and all it's Sects, in *England, Holland, Switzerland, Germany,* and so forth? ‡ *What other Spirit therefore, but the Spirit of Lying, and Seducti-*

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.* and P. 313.

On

on, can have been the Author of a Reformation [meaning Chriſtianity] *built upon a Principle, which has been an inexhauſtible Source of Diviſions, wherever it got footing?* For Chriſtianity, in general, as I have || elſewhere ſhewn, is no leſs *built* upon the *Principle* of *reading the Scriptures*, and *underſtanding them with our own Underſtandings*, than Proteſtantiſm in particular.

P. 314. G. *The Unity you ſpeak of is moſt certainly a Mark of Truth. For Truth is eſſentially one; but the Errors oppoſite to it are infinite.* Becauſe Truth is one, and the Errors oppoſite to it are infinite; THEREFORE whatever People unite in muſt be Truth. I can ſee no manner of Connexion between Theſe two Propoſitions. Truth may be one, as it certainly *is*; and the Errors oppoſite to it innumerable, as they certainly *may be*, for it is not *neceſſary* they *ſhould be*; and notwithſtanding This, a vaſt Number of Men, nay all the World, may ſingle out *one* of Thoſe Errors, and *unite* in it. Neither can it be prov'd by any other Argument, that the Agreement of Multitudes in This, or That, is a ſure Sign of it's being true. As our Author's Reaſoning from *our Di-*

|| Rep. truly Stat.

viſions

viſions is no leſs ſtrong *againſt* Chriſtianity than againſt Proteſtantiſm; ſo his Reaſoning from the *Unanimity*, of Papiſts is as ſtrong *for* Heatheniſm, or *Turciſm*, as for Popery. To have all it's Profeſſors agree in every thing, or to have many Differences in Opinion among them, is purely *accidental* to *any* Religion: The One does not prove it to be true; nor the Other to be falſe. Not that, after all, there is more Harmony among *Them* than among *Us*; as I have often been compell'd to obſerve.

To the Fifth, and Laſt SECTION:

ENTITLED,

The General external Marks of the true Church on the one Side, compared with the entire Want of them on the other.

I Hope the Reader will pardon my chuſing to refer him, as I ſometimes do, from one Part of my Anſwer to another, rather than to ſay the ſame Thing over and over. I muſt here intreat him to look back upon *P.* 181, to the End of That Section, before he proceeds with This.

P. 316. England, *by it's Converſion, became a Part of That Society of Chriſtians which alone can glory in having all thoſe external Marks of the true Church*, &c. meaning by *That Society of Chriſtians* the Church of *Rome*. Whereas *England* by it's Converſion became united with *all* the Societies of Chriſtians in the *World*, as well as with the Church of *Rome*: It became a Part of the Catholick Church; of which the Church of *Rome* herſelf was, and is, no more than a Part. His affirming that

that She only has *the Marks*, comes next to be conſider'd.

* *Perpetual Viſibility, and Catholicity*, He ſays, *are two external Marks inſeparable from the Church of Chriſt, and incommunicable to a new rais'd Communion.* The Church of *England* by the Reformation was not a *new-rais'd* Communion; as we ſhall ſee preſently. As for the Marks he mentions; he might have ſpar'd his Pains in ſpending two Pages, to *prove* that the *Church is viſible.* It certainly is ſo, and always will be, one way or other. Not that *Inviſibility*, or the Notion of the Church conſider'd as *inviſible*, is ‡ *repugnant to the very End for which Chriſt has eſtabliſh'd Paſtors and Preachers in his Church*, conſider'd as *viſible:* Of which hereafter. Much might be ſaid too upon This Subject, diſtinguiſhing the ſeveral Sorts of Viſibility: Concerning which I refer to a ſhort Treatiſe of Biſhop *Sanderſon*'s, written with the trueſt Judgment, and good Senſe (as every thing of That incomparable Prelate's is) entitled, *A Diſcourſe concerning the Church, in Theſe following Particulars; The Viſibility of the true Church; The Church of* Rome; *Proteſtant Churches*, &c. London, *Printed for* R. Taylor, 1688. Their Church,

---

* *Ibid.* ‡ P. 317.

we

we grant, was, and is viſible: Ours was once ſubject to Theirs, and was Then *viſible*, tho' *corrupt*, and is Now *viſible*, tho' *reform'd*. || *As to the Church's Catholicity, or Univerſality, both in regard of Time and Place*, &c. to the End of the ſecond Paragraph. This is anſwer'd in the Place I referr'd to at the Beginning of this Section. I therefore only obſerve upon Thoſe Words, * *If the Apoſtolical Succeſſion —— ſhould in one and the ſame Communion be at any time entirely extinct, it could not be ſaid that Chriſt has remain'd with*, &c. *to the End of the World*: That if by *one, and the ſame Communion* be meant the univerſal Church, it is true; If it means a particular Church, as we muſt crave leave to ſay the Church of *Rome* is, till the contrary is prov'd; it is falſe. Have not many particular Churches actually periſh'd? † *Sir*, ſays the young Gentleman, *I ſee very plainly that perpetual Viſibility and Catholicity are external Marks inſeparable from the true Church of Chriſt.* This is, in Effect, the ſame juggling as before. If *the* Church means the Church univerſal, as it ought to do; it is true, but no Diſcovery, and nothing to the Purpoſe, that perpetual Viſibility and Catholicity are inſeparable from her; tho', by the way, the *Univerſality*

|| *P.* 117, 118. * *P* 118, † *Ibid.*

of

of the Church *Univerſal*, that is in plain, tho' bad *Engliſh*, the *Wholeneſs* of the *Whole*, is an odd Kind of *Mark*. If *the* Church means *a* Church, as it ought not to do; neither perpetual Viſibility, nor Catholicity is an inſeparable Mark of it: Nay, to ſay the latter is ſo, is a Contradiction. But I am inſenſibly breaking my Promiſe, and unawares repeating what I have ſaid in the Place referred to.

* *I pretend to ſhew*, ſays the Preceptor, *that as* England *was by its Converſion made a Part of that Society of Chriſtians to which Thoſe Marks of the true Church moſt undoubtedly belong'd, ſo was it by its Reformation cut off from that Society.* From this Place to the End of the Book our Author ſtrains all his Nerves, draws his Argument to a Head, and labours his Point with the utmoſt Diligence, to prove that the Church of *England* by the *Reformation* loſt its *Being*, and is now no Church at all. Let the Reader be *very attentive* in obſerving the Force of his Reaſonings: For I ſhall produce them in their *full Force*; and *do pretend to ſhew*, on the contrary, that his boaſted Strength is the moſt deſpicable Weakneſs. I ſhall be at the Pains of tranſcribing almoſt every thing

---

* *P.* 319.

he

he ſays, diſſect it minutely, and anſwer it Sentence by Sentence.

† *As to the Mark of Viſibility*, England *was by its Converſion incorporated with the Church of* Rome; *that is to ſay, with the whole Body of Chriſtians then in Communion with the See of* Rome. " This is very dark; and his *That is to ſay*, is a ſtrange one. Does he mean that the Church of *Rome* was the whole Body of Chriſtians, becauſe all the Chriſtian Churches in the World were then in Communion with her? (As they very well might be, ſhe being as then pure, and uncorrupt, tho' now the Caſe is much alter'd with her, and was ſo at the Time of the Reformation.) If this be his Meaning; he may as well ſay that becauſe all the Pariſh is in perfect Friendſhip with *John*, therefore *John* is all the Pariſh. But why ſhould not *William*, *Thomas*, or *Richard*, have as good a Right to That Catholick Title? They being *all* ſuppos'd to be in Friendſhip with *each other*. Was not the Church of *Rome* as much in Communion with all other Churches, as all other Churches with Her? Why muſt She therefore, upon the Score of Communion, be the whole Body of Chriſtians, any more than any other particular Church? Or does he mean, that all the Chriſtian Churches

† *Ibid.*

being

being then in Communion with That of *Rome*, whatever Society became a Part of the Church of *Rome*, became a Part of the Church Universal, or the whole Body of Christians? This is very true; but the same might as well be said of joining with any other particular Church upon Earth. However it be; our Author seems to have a *Fetch* in expressing himself thus *ambiguously*: 'Tis to make the Church of *Rome look* at least like the *whole* Church; and That is better than Nothing. Let him mean what he will; I say, as I said above, and more will be said of it immediately, that *England* at its Conversion was no more incorporated with the Church of *Rome*, than with any *other* Church.

* *Now the Pastors of This Church had in their own Communion, an uninterrupted visible Succession of Bishops, from the Apostles down to the Time wherein* England *was converted.* Well; so had the Pastors of other Churches: And what then? *It* THEREFORE *became a Part of* THAT *Church, &c.* Does it follow that *England* at it's Conversion became a Part of the Church of *Rome*, because the Church of *Rome* had a Succession of Bishops down to that time? This *therefore* is as strange as the *that is to say* above-mention'd. *England*, as I said, became Part,

---

* Ibid. ‡ Ibid.

not

not of the Church of *Rome*, but of the univerſal, or Catholick Church. Why does he not prove, as well as affirm, that it became a Part of the Church of *Rome* ? Its being converted by Miſſionaries from *Rome* proves no ſuch thing. *England* is converted to Chriſtianity by *Romans* : Or, if you pleaſe, a Church in *England*, or the Church of *England*, is planted by *Romans*: Is the Church of *England* therefore a Part of the Church of *Rome* ? The ſame Argument will as well prove that the *Nation* of *England* is a Part of *Italy*. According to this, the Church of *Rome* it ſelf was but a Part of the Church of *Jeruſalem*; for it was planted by *Jews*. Not that it would ſignify any thing to the Merits of the Cauſe, if his Aſſertion were true: If the Church of *England* at firſt were a Part of the Church of *Rome*; ſhe afterwards did well in *ſo far* ceaſing to be a *Part* of her, as to renounce her Corruptions, and be no longer a *Partaker* of her Sins. Nor did This *unchurch* her: On the contrary, it made her a much *better Church* than ſhe was before. Suppoſe the Church of *England* (our Adverſaries, for Argument's Sake, admitting her to be now a true Church) ſhould all, except one Dioceſs, be over-run with the *Arian* Hereſy, and make the Belief of it a Term of Communion. I hope That Dioceſs

would neither be Heretical, nor Schismatical, in refusing to communicate with the rest of the Church of *England*. * *Which Church* (continues He, meaning That of *Rome*) *had the Mark of its being the true Church demonstrable in its perpetual Visibility*. Does he mean this perpetual Visibility *à parte ante*, or *à parte post*; backwards, or for the time to come, or both ways? *Was* the Church of *Rome* perpetually visible in the *high, glorious* Sense, as the *Romanists* always mean? Was it so, when it did not consist of above twenty, or thirty Souls? Or if it was; were no other Churches so? This is but a poor Mark of *the true* Church: And if we consider it as to *Futurity*, it is a worse. For how can That be a Mark to us *now*, which we shall never see till the Day of Judgment? The Church of *Rome's* future perpetual Visibility is *a demonstrable Mark of its being the true Church*: That is, we are *Now* to be guided by a Mark which nothing but *Time* can shew us; and which in Probability will never be shewn at all. Besides; if the Church of *Rome* should continue to the World's End, as I verily believe she will not; does it follow that no *other* Church must so continue? If not; how can This be a *Mark* to *Her*? For our Author must not *here* at least take it

* *Ibid.*

for

for granted that ſhe is the only Church; becauſe That is the very thing to be *now* prov'd. He adds, * *When therefore it* (the Church of *England*) *by its pretended Reformation ſeparated itſelf from the Communion of the Church of* Rome, *and ſo became a new rais'd Communion; it ceas'd to be a Part of the true Church.* 1ſt. Properly ſpeaking (as I have ſeveral times had occaſion to obſerve) We did not ſeparate from the Church of *Rome*, but the Church of *Rome* from Us: Nor are We ſo much as ſeparated from the Church of *Rome* in all things, but only in her Corruptions. 2dly, the Church of *England* did not by its Reformation become a new-rais'd Communion: It continued to be, what it was before, the Church of *England*. For the Church of *England* it was, even when it was in Subjection to the See of *Rome*. She did not therefore by the Reformation ceaſe to be a Part of the true Church; Becauſe ſhe never was a Part of the Church of *Rome*: Or, if ſhe had been, the Church of *Rome* was never the true Church.

† *Sir, if* England, *when it ſeparated itſelf from the Church of* Rome, *did not at the ſame time ſeparate itſelf from the true Church.* —— Here one would expect he ſhould *prove* the Church of *Rome* to be *the*

---

* *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

true Church. Instead of which, we are put off with a Shuffle, laying the Burthen of Proof upon Us; contrary to the Laws of Disputation, and right Reason. † *The Advocates for the Church of* England *are bound to mark out to us in what other visible Society of Christians the true Chuch subsisted before the Reformation.* 1st. Had the Church of *Rome*, and all other Churches besides ours, utterly perish'd before our Reformation, and no Society of Christians remain'd in the World, but in *England*; That would have been sufficient to secure the Being of the true Church: The true Church would have subsisted in That, pure at first, afterwards corrupt, then pure again. So we are not *bound to mark out*, &c. Not but that, 2dly. Nothing is more easy to be done. The true Church, before the Reformation, subsisted in many other visible Societies of Christians, commonly call'd particular Churches, besides That of *Rome*; not only in *Europe*, and among others in *England*, but also in *Asia*, and *Africa*, the *Greek* Churches especially: All these were true particular Churches, tho' all, both Eastern and Western, very corrupt; and in them the true Universal Church subsisted. * *Nay over and above they must shew that at the time of it's Separation from*

---

* *Ibid.*

the

the Church of Rome, *it became a Part of, and was incorporated with, that other pre-exiſtent viſible Church.* 1ſt. It was not neceſſary it ſhould be a Part at all; tho' in Fact it was ſo; it might have been itſelf the Whole. This Gentleman ſeems to have a very ſingular Notion, that it is eſſential to a Church to be *a Part*, to be *incorporated*. As if any particular Church, That of *England* for example, muſt neceſſarily periſh, if all others ſhould: In That Caſe, inſtead of being *a* Church, it would be *the* Church. According to this Notion, the firſt Church, That of *Jeruſalem*, was no true one; And if ſo, I am ſure there has been none ſince. 2dly. There were however, as we have ſeen, many other Churches at the Reformation. But why muſt we ſhew that the Church of *England* THEN became incorporated with them? She was incorporated with them BEFORE, as Part of the Univerſal Church; and ſo continued; only ſhe became more pure than any of them were, or than ſhe herſelf had been. She continued incorporated with all the Churches in the World, the Church of *Rome* itſelf among others, in all things except their Corruptions.

† Now for his famous *Dilemma*: For tho' it be abundantly anſwer'd by what has been

† 320.

said; yet since it *is* a *Dilemma*, we must have the Answer over again. *When they separated themselves from the Church of* Rome; *it either was the true Church of Christ, or it was not.* I answer, it was Not THE *true* Church; it was only A *true* Church, and that too in the lowest Sense of the Word. † *If they say it was Not; they must either shew us another visible Society of Christians upon Earth, in which the true Church of Christ was preserv'd before the Reformation, and this is* IMPOSSIBLE *for them to do; or they must say that Christ had no true Church upon Earth before that time, and that by Consequence the Creed was false for many Ages; which is downright Blasphemy.* 1st. 'Tis not necessary to shew another visible Society before the Reformation, besides That of *Rome*, or any other besides *herself.* Had she been the only Church in the World, she would have been the whole Church; so that even then Christ would have had a true Church, tho' a corrupt one. We may here observe in passing, that our Author seems to think there can be no Reformation of a Church; unless there be a Church of *Rome* to be *separated from.* 2dly. We *do* shew many other such Churches; and I have named them. † *But if they own that the Church*

‖ *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

of

of Rome *was the true Church of Chriſt before the Reformation; then they muſt own of courſe that they ſeparated themſelves from the true Church of Chriſt, and continue ſeparated from it to this Day; which is pronouncing their own Condemnation.* 1ſt. The Church of *Rome* was not the true Church; nor do we own any ſuch thing. 2dly. If it had been; ſuppoſing the whole Church to be as corrupt as That of *Rome* was, it would be not only lawful, but neceſſary for any one Part, or Diſtrict of it, to reform itſelf; whether the reſt would or no. Nor would ſuch a Diſtrict become Schiſmatical, by refuſing to communicate with the reſt in their abominable Corruptions; but *they* would be Schiſmatical, in impoſing unlawful Terms of Communion. † *Unhappy Reformation*, concludes he, *which cannot anſwer for itſelf, without renouncing the Creed, or confeſſing itſelf guilty of Schiſm.* And unhappy Church of *Rome*, ſay I, which cannot aſſault the Reformation, with any Weapons, but groſs Forgeries inſtead of true Facts, and tranſparent Sophiſtry inſtead of ſolid Reaſoning.

The young Gentleman having, as uſual, paid his || Complements to the *Dilemma*, recogniz'd and ſaluted *both it's Horns*, talk'd of the *no Hole* we have to *creep out* at, and

† *Ibid.* || *Ibid.*

of the *mortal Wound* given us, *which ever* way we *turn* ourselves; the Preceptor, in the Fulness of Satisfaction and Triumph, proceeds Thus. * *Sir, it was the Force of this Argument* [O! the irresistible Force of it] that *oblig'd several Protestant Writers to have recourse to the wretched Chimera of an invisible Church, as the best expedient they could then think of to maintain the Authority of their Doctrine, and the Succession of their Pastors.* He should, I think, have nam'd some of these Writers; but whoever they be, they might have given a much better Answer; and had no occasion for this Recourse, as I have shewn. The Church of *Rome* was visible before the Reformation; and is still, both visible, and visibly corrupt: The Church of *England* was visible, when in Communion with the Church of *Rome*; and is visible still, tho' not in Communion with the Church of *Rome*. † *I call it a Chimera; because an invisible Church is in Reality a Church, and no Church.*" An *outward invisible* Church, if he pleases, is a Contradiction. But we may without any Absurdity say there *is an* invisible Church; or rather, that the Church in general, or any Church in particular, may be consider'd in

* *Ibid.* and P. 321. † *Ibid.*

two

two Reſpects; as viſible, in its *external Regimen* and Ordinances; as inviſible with relation to Chriſt. Beſides which, there is another Notion of an inviſible Church made uſe of by ſome Divines; who mean by it, and properly enough, I think, the *whole Body* of Thoſe who by *true Faith* and *Obedience* are united to Chriſt, and finally ſav'd. But be theſe things as they will, they are foreign to our Controverſy. † *So that Perſons reduc'd to this miſerable Shift give up the Cauſe*, &c. What if *they* do? The Cauſe is not therefore loſt: Since others defend it a much better Way; and let This Man anſwer them, if he knows how. * *I add that a Quaker, or Muggletonian needs not be in any Pain to trace the Antiquity of his Church, and Doctrine, even to* Noah, *or* Adam, *if he pleaſes; ſo he be but allow'd to have recourſe to an inviſible Church to make good his Pretenſions.*" Theſe *Quakers*, and *Muggletonians*, &c. are of wonderful Service to him. But I anſwer; *Their* Doctrines are *falſe*; and would be ſo, tho' they could be traced up to *Noah*, or *Adam*: And the ſame may be ſaid of *Popiſh* ones. Could *Quakers* and *Muggletonians* have recourſe even to a *viſible* Church, underſtanding by the Word a viſible Body, or Sect of Men, and run it up to the

† *Ibid.* * *Ibid.*

Days

Days of *Noah*, or *Adam* himſelf; That would not prove them a *Church*, as both Papiſts, and We, uſually and properly underſtand the Word; becauſe They have no *Orders*. Nor would it prove their *Doctrines* to be true; becauſe falſe Doctrine may be, and actually is, as old as *Adam*, and *Eve*. For the Devil taught falſe Doctrine to the Latter. *We*, on the contrary, have demonſtrated our *Doctrines* to be true, and our *Orders* to be as good as Thoſe of our Popiſh Adverſaries.

* *When therefore they were driven out of This*, &c. *many of them, as the* Calviniſts *in* France, *call'd to their Aid all the broken, and ſhatter'd Troops of condemn'd Hereticks to patch up a kind of ridiculous Succeſſion.* Theſe *were the old Iconoclaſts, Albigeois, Vaudois*, &c. What is This to the Church of *England?* Thoſe of whom he ſpeaks put it upon another wrong Foot: There was no more occaſion for recurring to *This*, than to the Notion of an *inviſible Church*. [Tho', by the way, This ſhews that Popery was not in quiet Poſſeſſion, for many Ages before the Reformation.] They ſhould have continued the Succeſſion of Orders, as We did in *England*. However, Thoſe whom our Author here

* *Ibid.*

calls

calls Hereticks were not Hereticks. The *Eiconoclaſts*, in plain Engliſh *Image-Breakers*, were much more Orthodox Chriſtians than *Image-Worſhippers*: The *Albigeois* were not *a Spawn* of the *Manichæans*: The *Berengarians*, *Huſſites*, *Vaudois*, and *Bohemian Brethren*, were *imperfect Reformers*: They were guilty of ſome Errors, but were much better than Papiſts. * *A ſtrange ſort of Apoſtolical Succeſſion! Which began not till many Ages after the Apoſtles, was interrupted with Gaps of ſeveral hundred Years, and compos'd of Sects all differing*, &c. Afterwards he tells us, All Theſe, as Proteſtants pretend, † *preſerv'd the Church's Viſibility, and continued the Succeſſion of her Paſtors in the right Line.* WE ſay no ſuch Thing: The Church of *Rome*, and Thoſe in ſubjection to her, tho' corrupt in Doctrine, and Practice, kept up the Succeſſion of Paſtors in the right Line.

‡ *As to the Proteſtants of the Church of* England, *I know not what way they pretend to derive their Eccleſiaſtical Succeſſion from the Apoſtles.* Are you in earneſt? Did You never hear, that We *pretend* at leaſt, to derive it in the ſame Line that You do? || *Only this I am ſure of, that* Thomas Cranmer *was the firſt Proteſtant*

---

* *Ibid.* † P. 322. ‡ *Ibid.* || *Ibid.*

Bishop, and Primate of England; *He had not therefore any Predecessors of the Protestant Communion.* That is, there was no Protestant Bishop before there was a Protestant Bishop: Which I grant. ‖ *And by consequence, tho' he sate in the Archiepiscopal Chair,* &c. *he could not justly pretend to derive his Succession from the Apostles, after he had separated himself from the Communion of Those who were the true and undoubted Successors of the Apostles.* 1st. He, and his Brother Reformers, Bishops, as well as others, were not properly, and schismatically Separatists. 2dly, If They had been; their Episcopal Character had continued. But I insist upon the Former. * *For surely the Apostles will never own any for their true, and lawful Successors, but Bishops and Pastors of their own Communion, and Members of That Church which They founded.* I have read, in the *Acts*, † of the *Apostles Fellowship*, or *Communion* (to which, by the way, is added their *Doctrine*, wherein the Church of *Rome* does not *continue stedfast*;) but how the Church of *Rome*, especially as corrupted, and deprav'd, comes to be *Their* Communion, and that exclusively of all other Churches, I can by no means understand. Any more than I can,

‖ *Ibid.* * *Ibid.* † Acts 2. 42.

how

how the Apoſtles founded *That* Church, *as* ſo corrupt; or that they founded no *other* Church at all. *Cranmer*, was as *true*, *and undoubted a Succeſſor* of the Apoſtles, as Thoſe from whom our Author ſays He ſeparated: And They were the Schiſmaticks in continuing to impoſe unlawful Terms of Communion; not He in refuſing any longer to comply with them. ‡ *If* Thomas Cranmer *was entitled to a Place in the Apoſtolical Family; all the* Arian, Novatian, *and* Donatiſt *Biſhops were likewiſe entitled to the ſame Prerogative.* 1ſt. The *Arian*, *Novatian*, and *Donatiſt* Biſhops continued to be of the *Apoſtolical Family*, as Biſhops, tho' not as *Arians*, *Novatians*, and *Donatiſts*. 2dly. *Cranmer* was neither an *Arian*, a *Novatian*, nor a *Donatiſt*; nor guilty either of Hereſy, or Schiſm, by refuſing to continue in Communion with the Church of *Rome*. On the contrary, the Papiſts were, and are, both Hereticks, and Schiſmaticks. * *But This has not hinder'd but that they have been always regarded as a ſpurious Race, unworthy to be counted among the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles.* A ſpurious Race in Doctrines and Practiſes, as the Papiſts are; but true Succeſſors of the Apoſtles in point of Epiſcopacy, as the Popiſh Biſhops

‡ *Ibid.* * *Ibid.*

are

are likewiſe. Be it as it will; This affects not *Cranmer*: who was in neither reſpect ſpurious. † *And why ſo? Becauſe by teaching Doctrines unknown to the Biſhops that went before them* [as *Cranmer* did *Not*] *they broke off, or were ſpew'd out of the Communion of Thoſe, who were the true, and undoubted Succeſſors of the Apoſtles.* Why ſo much of *true and undoubted?* As if *Cranmer* were not as *true and undoubted* a Succeſſor of the Apoſtles, as any other Biſhop. This Writer himſelf afterwards owns he was. But This is thrown in, to *puzzle*, and *confound*; as I have obſerv'd of other Strokes in his Performance. But to anſwer directly: The *Arians*, *Novatians*, and *Donatiſts* unjuſtly broke off, or were juſtly ſpew'd out, or Both: But the Reverſe is *Cranmer*'s Caſe. ‡ *So that we may put the Queſtion to Archbiſhop* Cranmer, *wherewith* Tertullian *puzzled the Hereticks of his time. Qui eſtis vos? Quando, et unde veniſtis?* You may put the ſame Queſtions; but not with the ſame Reaſon: And we are not afraid of being near ſo much *puzzled* by them. Deſiring the Reader to remember what I have abundantly prov'd in my Examination of the 2d, and 3d, Dialogues, I will put the Queſtions to

† *Ibid.* and *P.* 323. ‡ *P.* 323.

Cranmer

Cranmer in our Author's own Words; and *Cranmer* ſhall be *ſuppos'd* to anſwer them in His.

Papiſt. *"Who are you, *Thomas Cranmer?* "when, and whence did you come?

Cranmer. Strange Queſtions to a Man of my Dignity, and high Station. You know I am Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and Primate of all *England*; two of the moſt illuſtrious Titles in the Chriſtian World: Tho' you are pleas'd to call me by the familiar Name of *Thomas Cranmer*. As to your *when*, and *whence*; if you mean (for I ſuppoſe you do not expect I ſhould tell you I came *this Morning* from *Lambeth*:) Who gave me my *Authority* as Archbiſhop? tho' you have *none* to examine me: I ſtill wonder at your Queſtion: Since you know, as well as I; and do not yourſelves pretend but that my Authority, in this reſpect, is unqueſtionable.

Papiſt. "Who gave you a Commiſſion to "enſlave the Hierarchy to the ſecular "Power?

Cranmer. Nobody; Nor did I, or any one elſe, ſo enſlave it.

Papiſt. "Or to make a Layman and a "Child ſupreme Judges of Controverſies in "Religion, and the Fountains of [all] Ec- "cleſiaſtical Juriſdiction?

---

* P. 323.

Cranmer.

Cranmer. I had no such Commission; Nor is any such thing done, by Me, or Any body else.

Papist. "Whence had you your Powers "to turn upside down the Frame of the "Church committed to your Charge; to "change the Faith and Worship which St. "*Augustine* had establish'd; and introduce "Doctrines to which the Bishops your Pre-"decessors had been utter Strangers for 900 "Years together?

Cranmer. You talk as if the Reformation was made by *me* only: When you very well know it was made by the joint Legislative Authority of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers. However; the Frame of the Church and Religion was turn'd upside down Before, and is Now set upon it's right Bottom. The Faith and Worship which St. *Austin* establish'd is not chang'd, but restor'd; Neither were the Bishops my Predecessors utter Strangers for 900 Years to the Doctrines which you say are introduced, but which are, in truth, only restor'd: They profess'd the same for about 200 Years; And so did the Universal Church from the Time of the Apostles before them. And if any of those Primitive Worthies were now living; They would be *utter Strangers* to *your* Religion.

* *Now*

* *Now whoever will pretend to anſwer Theſe Queſtions for* Cranmer; *I defy him*, &c. This *Defiance* happens to be anſwer'd already: And ſo I ſay no more of it.

There is *no Difference*, He ſays, † between the Caſe of *Cranmer* and Q. *Elizabeth*'s Biſhops; *but what makes rather to their Diſadvantage. Becauſe the Validity of* Cranmer's *Ordination never was diſputed by Any. Whereas That of Q.* Elizabeth's *Biſhops has never been allow'd of by the Church of* Rome; *And her Authority is of no ſmall Weight.* 1ſt. That of Q. *Elizabeth*'s Biſhops was never queſtion'd by any Member of the Church of *Rome*, till above 40 Years after their Ordination: When That ſenſeleſs Lye of the *Nag's-Head* was firſt invented. 2dly, The Church of *Rome*'s Authority is of no Weight at all; becauſe She is Judge in her own Cauſe. ‡ *But ſuppoſing it were valid; it would avail them nothing in the main. For they would at the beſt be but upon the ſame Level with* Cranmer, *&c.* And That, as I have ſhewn, is enough: For the Sophiſtry of Thoſe Words *their own Communion*, and *the ſame Communion*, which are * here again drag'd in, has been ſufficiently laid open. And Thoſe, † *There was no viſible Prote-*

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.* and *P.* 324. * *P.* 324. † *Ibid.*

stant Communion before there was a Protestant Reformation comes to This; There was no Reformation before there was a Reformation.

‡ *The Mark call'd Catholicity*, we are told, *was never deny'd to the Church in Communion with the See of* Rome, *even by it's profess'd Enemies.* Yes, but it was; and still is; in both Senses of the Word. She is not Catholick, as it signifies Universal: For That is a Contradiction, making a Part to be the Whole. She is not Catholick, as it signifies teaching the Doctrine of the truly Catholick Church: In That Sense the Church of *England* is Catholick; and the Church of *Rome* is not.

‖ *Nay in all Protestant Countries — we are as well distinguish'd by the bare Name of* Catholicks; *as a Native of* England *is known by the Name of an Englishman.* This is a most admirable Argument! An Argument from a *Word*; like That about the *Mass* elsewhere mention'd. But 1st. 'Tis not true that This Language obtains universally. Few, or None among us, of Learning and Knowledge in these Matters, call them *Catholicks*, or *Roman Catholicks* either. 2dly, If all Mankind, to avoid quarrelling about a *Word*, did make use of

---

‡ *Ibid.* ‖ *Ibid.*

This

This to diſtinguiſh a certain Set of Men, who ridiculouſly call themſelves by That Name; yet it would not follow that All others muſt *allow* them to be what They themſelves *pretend* to be. Nevertheleſs, I muſt do our Author the Juſtice to own that This Argument, as fooliſh as it is, is made uſe of by the great *Bellarmine*; who makes the Name *Catholick his firſt Note* of the Church.

It is here to be obſerv'd that our Author in This Paragraph has twice This Expreſſion, *the Church in Communion with the See of Rome.* In all his Argument hitherto, it has been *the Church of Rome:* Now 'tis *the Church in Communion with the See of Rome.* Three Pages hence it will be *the Churches in Communion with the See of Rome.* This does not look fair; But we wave it at preſent.

The Church of Rome, * He ſays, *has Univerſality of Time, by having had an uninterrupted viſible Being from the Time of the Apoſtles to this Day.* I anſwer, ſo has the Church of *England.* † *And of Place, by having not only extended her Faith to the moſt remote, and barbarous Nations; tho' now Apoſtatiz'd from it* —— HER Faith? What? Did the Church of *Rome* plant the

---

* P. 325. † *Ibid.*

Asian and *African* Churches, which are now extinct? This is News to us. I thought St. *John*, St. *Thomas*, and the rest of the Apostles, and Apostolical Men, who never were Members of the Church of *Rome*, had planted them. Besides; had the Primitive Church of *Rome* extended HER Faith to Those Nations; THAT Faith was not the Faith of the *present* Church of *Rome*. —— † *But by being likewise in full possession of all those Nations of* Europe *where the reform'd Churches are now establish'd.* How was She in possession of them? They were in communion with her, I own; partook of her Corruptions; and were by her Tyranny, and their own Misfortune, or Folly, or Both, in subjection to her: but they were not Parts of her, as we have seen. ‡ *Nay, she has at this very time Bishops, and Pastors propagating the Gospel among the Infidels both of the East, and West Indies.* So have *We*, Pastors, tho' not Bishops: And there is even a Bishop over Those Pastors; tho' he does not reside in any of Those Countries. * *Therefore Universality of Place which St.* Augustine *calls the Consent of People, and Nations, cannot be deny'd her.* What? Has She the Consent of all People, and Nations? Or is she

† *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.* * *Ibid.*

diffus'd

diffus'd over the Face of the whole Earth? Not that it would be any Argument, if ſhe were. For being *the Catholick Church* does not mean being *ſpread* over *all* the *World*; but being *all* the Church *that is*, whether it be greater, or leſs. If the former were the Caſe; there would have been no Catholick Church at all: And would be none Now. For the Church, at the Beginning, conſiſted but of 3000 Souls; and at this Day not above a ſixth Part of the World is poſſeſs'd by Chriſtians of all Denominations put together. † *Nor can it conſequently be deny'd but that* England *by it's Converſion had the Advantage of being made Partaker of the illuſtrious Title of* Catholick, *in the full Extent of it's Signification.* In other Words; Becauſe the Church of *Rome* extends over all the World, which it *does not*, and *never did*: THEREFORE *England* at it's Converſion being made a PART of the Church of *Rome* which it *was not*, became PARTAKER of the illuſtrious Title of being the WHOLE. The Reader, I hope, by this time pities me for having undertaken to travel thro' ſuch an Ocean of Falſhoods and Abſurdities.

Is even That Part of the World which is *Chriſtian*, ALL of it *Popiſh?* So

† *Ibid.*

far otherwise, that the Members of the Church of *Rome* bear no Proportion to the infinitely greater Number of Christians who condemn many of her Doctrines, and reject all her Authority. Even in These Parts of *Europe*, Papists do not out number Christians, near so much as it is commonly imagined. * But if to the Reform'd Churches in These Parts, we add all the Christian World besides, which is not Popish, in *Europe*, *Asia*, and *Africa*; the boasted *Amplitude* of the *Romish* Church, and *Number* of Roman-Catholicks will be inconsiderable. To pass over the vast Bodies of *Armenian* Christians, *Abassines*, *Jacobites*, and Multitudes more; † "We need not instance in any besides the *Greek* Church. "Which has had an uninterrupted Succession of Bishops from the Apostles, is of "greater Antiquity than the Church of "*Rome*; and has produced more *Fathers* "than That Church. This Church is divided into many Nations; as the *Hyberians*, the People of *Colchis*, now call'd "*Mingrelia*, the *Arabians*, *Chaldæans*, "*Æthiopians*, *Ægyptians*, *Muscovites*, *Bulgarians*, *Sclavonians*, *Albanians*, *Cara-*

* See *Brerewood*'s Enquiries. † See Bp. *Fowler* on *Bellarmine*'s 4th Note of the Church.

"*manians*,

" *manians*, *Walachians*, *Moldavians* *Gre-*
" *cians*, &c. And we may gueſs what a
" huge Diſproportion there is in Largeneſs,
" between all the *Greek* Churches and,
" Thoſe ſubject to the Church of *Rome*,
" by This, that the Countries in *Europe*,
" and *Aſia*, which the *Muſcovites* alone
" inhabit, are computed to be near of as
" great an Extent, as all *Europe* beſides."
I know very well the Papiſts have a ſhort Anſwer to This: All Theſe are not true Churches, nor true Chriſtians; And they ſay the ſame of *Us*. They are very corrupt, I confeſs; and ſo is the Church of *Rome*. But why muſt They be *no* Churches? *No* true Chriſtians? Why becauſe they are not Papiſts. The Argument bottoms, as other Popiſh Arguments do, upon the noble Principle of Begging the Queſtion. They prove all others to be no Churches, becauſe *They only* are *the* Church: when the very Point in Queſtion is, whether they are, or no.

* *But did it's Separation from the Communion of the Church of* Rome *procure it any Advantage equivalent to This?* It procur'd none at all, if it did not procure an Advantage equivalent to *Nothing*. But it did procure an ineſtimable Advantage, the *Purity* of *Chriſtian Religion*. † *Was*

† *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

there besides the Roman *Catholick Church, another Catholick Church of a different Communion*—? There cannot be two Catholick, *i. e.* Universal Churches, of a *different* Communion, nor of the *same* Communion; because there cannot be two Wholes with respect to the same Aggregate of Parts: Or, in plainer Words, because one Thing cannot be two Things. ‡ *To which* England *was associated*, &c. *That's giving the Lye to the Creed*, &c. And so on to the End of the next Paragraph, with the Unity, and Perpetuity of the Church, and the Absurdity of Invisibility: All which we have had, about a dozen times over, already. ‖ *Or finally did* England *itself become the Catholick Church by it's Separation from the Church of* Rome? No. Tho' it *might have* been *the* Church, as I observ'd; And *would have* been, if all other Churches had perish'd. ‡ *That is still stranger, and stranger! And indeed the same stupendious Wonder, as if a little Finger cut off from the Body should become the whole Body.* Just so we say of the Church of *Rome*; and with much more Reason, 1st. Because the Church of *England* did not schismatically cut off, or divide herself from *Her.*

‖ *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.* and *P.* 326.

2dly,

2dly, Becauſe the Church of *England* never pretended to be the whole Body; and the Church of *Rome* does. To this we may well add, that his Compariſon is incongruous, and improper. Becauſe the Church conſiſts of *homogeneous* Parts; not of *heterogeneous*, as a human Body does. Nor is This an empty Subtilty: but very material to our preſent Controverſy, and that upon more Accounts than One. No Part of a human Body, as a Finger, Hand, Arm, or Leg, *is* a human Body: But every Part of the whole Church is a Church; as every Drop of Water is Water, every Piece of Gold is Gold: including the whole Nature of Water, or Gold. If a Limb, when join'd to a human Body, is not a human Body; much leſs, if poſſible, can it become a human Body by being ſeparated from one: So far otherwiſe, that it muſt ſoon periſh; and even while it continues, it is of no Uſe. But if all the Catholick Church, except one Part of it, *i. e.* one particular Church, be overſpread with Antichriſtian Errors, and impoſe them as Terms of Communion; That Part may, and ought to go off from it: Notwithſtanding which, it ſtill continues a Church, including in itſelf the whole Nature of a Church.

† *However*

† *However, as it is much easier to confute, than silence certain People,* [Popish Priests, for example] *there are some who answer by owning*, &c. in short, that the Church of *Rome* was, and is, a *true* Church; because it holds all the *Essentials*. ‡ AND so *Christ always had a Church upon Earth.* By your Leave, we do not answer So. We say indeed that the Church of *Rome* is in *one sense* a *true* Church; but we say withal, that Christ would have had a true Church upon Earth, tho' That of *Rome* had long since perish'd.

* "*G.* But how then do They justify "their Separation from the Church of *Rome*; "if it both is, and was, a true Church before "the Reformation?

"*P.* By saying that besides Essentials, it im- "poses many Articles as Terms of Commu- "nion, which at the best are *doubtful*, and "not *necessary* to be believ'd. For which "reason they compare it to a human Body "disfigur'd with *Wens*, and other *Blemishes*; "tho' it has all the noble, and essential "Parts of a true Body." You are pleas'd to make us express ourselves very *tenderly*; Of which presently.

"*G.* Very fine indeed! The Thought is "quaint, and new." A smart Answer, young

† *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

Gentle-

Gentleman: not to ſay, ſomewhat *pert*. But the Thought is not *new*; it may perhaps be *quaint* enough: So quaint, that your Church will not eaſily get over it. How does your Tutor himſelf come off?

"*P.* I know not whether it be old, or "new; but I am ſure, *&c.*" in ſhort, that it only throws Duſt into ignorant People's Eyes. "For 1ſt, Their charging the Church "of *Rome* with impoſing Articles as *Terms* "*of Communion which are not neceſſary to* "*be believ'd*, is a mere precarious Aſſertion, "*&c.* On the contrary, it has been demon- "ſtrated a thouſand times that their preten- "ded *Wens*, and *Blemiſhes* are found Apo- "ſtolical Doctrines, *&c.*" I anſwer, 1ſt, We charge them with much more than impoſing Terms of Communion, which are not *neceſſary to Salvation*; we charge them with impoſing ſuch Terms as *directly lead to Damnation*. We inſiſt that their Church has not only *Wens* and *Blemiſhes*, but the *Plague*; that tho' ſhe retains the *Eſſentials*, yet ſhe is *deeply vitiated* even in *them*; and has blended abominable Corruptions with the very Vitals of Chriſtianity. 2dly, This Aſſertion of ours is not *precarious*, but has been *demonſtrated a thouſand times*. I my ſelf have demonſtrated the Truth of it, in This, and another Treatiſe. Not one of the diſtinguiſhing Doctrines of the Church of *Rome* is

is † *sound or Apostolical, as ancient as Christianity it self, taught in the very primitive Ages, and handed down as a Term of Catholick Communion from Age to Age from this very time*; as our Author with unparallel'd Confidence asserts they all are. They are contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles, and the primitive Church: They are so many Corruptions, and Adulterations of Christianity.

He answers, ‖ 2dly, That *from our owning* the Church of *Rome* to be a *true* Church *before the Reformation*, it will follow that Christ, in our Opinion, has *ever since the Reformation* had *more than one* true Church upon Earth. So he has; and had before the Reformation. *i. e. more than one particular* Church; tho' but one Catholick. And where is the Absurdity of This? ‖ "For "since, continues He, they are so generous as "to allow the Church of *Rome* to be one; "I presume they have no worse Opinion ei- "ther of their own, or other reform'd Chur- "ches. So that these, tho' all contradicting "one another in many important Points, "are nevertheless all true Churches: Which "I think is Nonsense with a Witness." 1st, They do not all contradict one another in many important Points. 2dly. They may do

† *Ibid.* ‖ *Ibid.*

so;

ſo; and yet be all true Churches. You will not take notice of the plain Diſtinction upon the Word *true*; which I have repeated ſo often, that I am reſolv'd to repeat it no more. Cannot two Men contradict one another in the moſt important Points; and yet both be *true*, *i. e. real* Men? The Caſe is exactly parallel as to Churches. This therefore is not *Nonſenſe with a Witneſs*; but very *good Senſe*. In another Place * you ſay, if the thing of which you are ſpeaking be not ſo, and ſo; you are *yet to learn what Nonſenſe is*. By your talking ſo wildly *about* it, and talking ſo much *of* it, one would think you were indeed.

† *Nor will the Matter be much mended by their Saying, that they are all but one Church to Chriſt; inaſmuch as they all believe in Chriſt.* Who ſays this? They are no otherwiſe one, than as being all put together they make up the one Catholick Church: As all the Parts make up one Whole. † "For "if this large Notion of Unity be allow'd "of; the Myſtical Body of Chriſt, inſtead "of being *compos'd* of *uniform* Parts, will "rather reſemble the Monſter deſcrib'd by "*Horace* with a Man's Head join'd to a "Horſe's Neck, *&c.* And his Garment, in-"ſtead of being *Seamleſs*, will be ſtitch'd "up together with as many different Pieces

* P. 317. † *Ibid.*

as

" as there are Patches in a Beggar's Coat." He had heard of the Church's conſiſting of *homogeneous*, which he calls *uniform* Parts, which I juſt now took Notice of; but either did not underſtand it, or would not rightly apply it. The Body of a Man, or of a Horſe, as truly conſiſts of heterogeneous Parts, as the Monſter he alludes to. And the Catholick Church may conſiſt of uniform Parts, if we muſt have That Word; and yet particular Churches differ in many Things even of Importance. Nor does this laſt break it's Unity; ſince, notwithſtanding That, they may hold Communion with each other, and agree in all neceſſary Points. * *But is it not ſomewhat ſurprizing that all the reform'd Churches, and the Church of* Rome, *That Church ſo hated, &c. ſhould be found at length to be but one, and the ſame Church?* Who, again, ſays This? The Church of *Rome* is certainly diſtinct from the Reform'd Churches, and They from each other, as particular Churches: And the Catholick Church is made up of Them, and all other particular ones. † *Or that ſo many Churches of different Communions and Religions ſhould be the One, Holy, Catholick, and Apoſtlick Church, which we profeſs to believe in the Creed?* 1ſt. We do not ſay that the Church of *Rome*,

---

* *Ibid.*

and

and the Reform'd Churches are the *one*, &c. There are many other Churches in the World beſides Theſe. 2dly. They may be of *different Communions*. (tho' if they be, there muſt be a *Schiſm* ſomewhere) and of *different Religions* in *ſome* reſpects; and yet all put together be the *one*, &c. for Reaſons which I have often given. Neither Schiſm, nor Hereſy, neceſſarily *deſtroys* a Church; tho' either of them makes it a *corrupt* Church. There is *one Sort* of *Schiſm* indeed, which makes Thoſe who are guilty of it *no Members* of the *Catholick* Church, becauſe it makes them *no Members* of *any particular* one. But This is beſide our preſent Queſtion.

† He ſays, 3dly, That according to this Conceſſion of ours, *viz.* that the Church of *Rome* is a true Church, we muſt regard the *very beſt* of our *Writers* and *Preachers*, *as a Pack of the vileſt Calumniators upon Earth.* He ſhould not ſurely call the beſt of our Divines by ſo *vile a Name*, without a good Reaſon: And what is That? —*In continually charging the Church of* Rome *with abominable Idolatry.* For He *cannot poſſibly conceive how Idolatry can be reconcil'd with the Eſſentials of a true Church.* What does he mean by *Reconcil'd*? Doubtleſs in

† *Ibid.*

tho

the *Nature of Things* there is no more Concord between Idolatry and the Essentials of a true Church, than there is between *Christ and Belial.* But yet as to *Persons*, a Church may be Idolatrous, and at the same time retain the Essentials of a true Church: As I have often said of the *Jews.*

* *Lastly, Their owning that the Church of* Rome *was A true Church, is a mere Put off; and does not answer either Part of my Dilemma directly.* Studious of Brevity as I am, I let pass something which might here be remark'd upon; and permit him to proceed without Interruption. † *For my Question is not whether the Church of* Rome *was A true Church before the Reformation: For That imports no more than asking whether it was a* PART *of the true Church of Christ.* This is the first time he has *spoke out* upon This Subject, and spoke to the Purpose. Let the Reader attend with the utmost Diligence to what follows. ‡ *But my Question, or Dilemma* [accurately express'd] *to which I* DEMAND A DIRECT ANSWER *is precisely This: viz. Whether before the Reformation the Church of* Rome *with all the Churches in Communion with That See was*

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

that

that One, Holy, Catholick, and Apoſtolick Church, the Belief whereof we profeſs to believe in the Creed, or not ? Here You alter the Queſtion : Juſt now you ſaid the Church of *Rome* : Here You ſay the Church of *Rome*, with all the Churches in communion with That See. And I ask, what do You mean by *in Communion with* ? *In Subjection to* ? Or barely *in Communion*, &c. according to the common way of ſpeaking ? If the Former ; I anſwer, as *directly* as You can deſire, that before the Reformation the Church of *Rome*, with all the Churches in Communion with That See (meaning, tho' very improperly *in Subjection to it*) was NOT That *One, Holy, Catholick*, and *Apoſtolick Church, the Belief whereof we profeſs in the* Nicene *Creed*. If the Latter ; 'tis impoſſible to anſwer You *directly* ; becauſe 'tis neceſſary to *diſtinguiſh* with reſpect to *different times* : Which Diſtinction You carefully avoid, as You do many others ; for a Reaſon too obvious to be mention'd. In the primitive times, when *all* the Churches *in the World* were in Communion with That of *Rome*, as they well might be, ſhe being Then uncorrupt ; the Church of *Rome* with all in Communion with her was That One, *&c.* Or rather, to ſpeak much more properly, the Church of *Rome*, AND all in Communion with her were That one, *&c.*

i. e. All the Parts made up the one Whole. But then who sees not that every particular Church in the World, as well as That of *Rome*, might have been *particularly mentioned* by *Name* (for there is really no more in it) all the rest being taken in the Lump. As Thus; The Church of *Jerusalem* with all in Communion with her is That One, *&c.* The Church of *Antioch* with all in Communion with her is That One, *&c.* And so of the rest. Unless our Author will say that all the other Churches were in Communion with That of *Rome*, but She not in Communion with Them, nor They with one another: And if He will, He shall enjoy his Saying without Disturbance. With respect to *other times*, particular Churches might be, and actually were, in, or out of, Communion with That of *Rome*, according as it happen'd: But their being out of Communion with *Her* no more made them cease to be *true* Churches, than their being out of Communion with *any other* particular Church. If any particular Church, or Churches, That of *Rome* among the rest, were *causelessly* out of Communion with *any* Church; They were Schismatical, but still they were Churches: Tho' if they were Not, 'tis nothing to our present Purpose; because This gives nothing *peculiar* to the Church of *Rome*. Whenever therefore all the Churches in the World were not

not in Communion with That of *Rome*; it would have been Falſe to ſay, "The "Church of *Rome* with all the Churches "in Communion with That See is That "One, *&c.*

But perhaps I need not have made This Diſtinction; becauſe, according to the *Romaniſts*, and as They manage the Matter, no Church *can be in Communion with* the Church of *Rome*, without being *in Subjection to* her. Upon which Foot, I anſwer *directly* as Above: Before the Reformation, the Church of *Rome* with Thoſe in Communion *with* her, and in Subjection *to* her, was NOT That One, *&c.* Becauſe of the *Greek* Churches, and many more which I have mention'd. So that his Aſſumption upon This Part of the Dilemma, * *If they ſay* not; *then the Creed was falſe before the Reformation, becauſe they cannot ſhew any other Society of Chriſtians, which was That Church*, is utterly falſe, and groundleſs. Tho' I might well ſtop here; yet as I have hitherto anſwer'd *both* the *Branches* of his Dilemmas, I will not now at laſt depart from That generous Method. † *But if they anſwer in the Affirmative; then the Church of* Rome, *with all the Churches in Communion with That See, was not only A true*

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

Church, but THE SOLE, *and only true Church of Chriſt upon Earth.* So, we have it *out* at laſt. This is the *grand Point* he has been labouring all this while; tho' he never *ſpoke the Words* 'till Now: He mentions them *but once*, as if he were *aſham'd* of them, as well he may be: But That *once* is at the *Cloſe* of all, in order to make the deeper and more laſting Impreſſion. The Aſſertion itſelf I have fully and particularly diſprov'd, in breaking the *other Horn* of his Dilemma, to which I refer, as alſo in many other Parts of my *Anſwer*. Nevertheleſs, the Reader ſhall ſee the Situation of the Argument as it Here ſtands. *But if they anſwer in the Affirmative* [as, remember, we do Not:] *i. e.* If We ſay *the Church of* Rome, *with all the Churches in Communion with that See, was That One Holy*, &c. *then the Church of* Rome *with all in Communion*, &c. *was* THE SOLE, *&c.* Which amounts to thus much in fewer, and plainer Words; If the Church of *Rome* was the only Church, the Church of *Rome* was the only Church; Underſtanding the Church of *Rome*, as the Word is us'd in it's wideſt Extent. But not to inſiſt upon That, let us conſider the *Conſequence* he draws from This, ſuppoſing the Propoſition to be true, as I have prov'd it to be moſt falſe. * *And by conſequence* England *was by it's pretend-*

* *Ibid.* and P. 329.

ed

ed Reformation cut off from the ſole, and only true Church of Chriſt upon Earth. I deny That. If a Separation was neceſſary, as We have ſhewn it was; Thoſe who made it neceſſary were the Schiſmaticks, as I have often ſaid: *They* were *cut off*, not *We*. According to This Arguing of his, *Elijah*, and the *ſeven thouſand* who would not worſhip *Baal*, were *cut off* from the *only* Church; and *Ahab*, and the Idolatrous Majority, were the true Catholicks. To talk plain Engliſh, and common Senſe; upon This Suppoſition, *viz.* that the Church of *Rome* and her Adherents were the only Church (tho' they were Not) every ſingle National Church, conſequently the whole Church of Chriſt, was corrupted; *England*, among the reſt. She *reform'd herſelf*; and Others *did not*. How is She *cut off?* She is pure, and They continue corrupt: She is therefore in a better Condition than They are; and than She herſelf was; but where's the *cutting off* all this while? Why 'tis palpable, ridiculous, ſtrutting, over-bearing, impudent Nonſenſe: contriv'd to delude ignorant Souls, and impoſe the groſſeſt Corruptions upon them.

However, according to Him, *cut off* it is; meaning *England:* † *And there*, ſays

† P. 329.

He, *I leave it.* His next Sentence is the best in his Book, * *For now I have done.* And so have I, for That reason: And am heartily glad of it; For never before did I labour through such a tiresome Maze of Fallacies, Falshoods, Swaggerings, Repetitions, and Impertinencies.

† The young Gentleman, having return'd his Thanks to his Preceptor for the great Care he has taken of him, says, that tho' he *has not yet Capacity enough to examine every Branch of Controversy by itself; yet he is sufficiently capable of discerning White from Black.* By your favour, Sir, according to the Principles of your Church, You have no Authority, any farther than She thinks fit, *to discern White from Black*; For when You see a certain Wafer, you are bound to believe it is a human Body. What he adds, that ‡ *an ignorant Tradesman may resolve,* &c. as solidly *as the ablest Scholar*, I have answer'd *P.* 385, *&c.* and desire every *Tradesman,* and all other unlearned Persons of either Sex, as they value their Souls, seriously to consider it. Leaving This also with the Reader, and intreating him never to forget it; for the more deeply he thinks of it, the more he will be convinced of it's Truth, and Importance: That suppo-

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.*

sing

ſing the *particular* Corruptions of Popery to be ſuch as We have demonſtrated them to be, the *general* Arguments of Papiſts againſt our *Reforming* as we did, are no better than ſo many Arguments againſt *Repentance*, whenever a *Multitude* is concern'd. Becauſe we were involv'd in a vaſt Body which was corrupt; therefore We, being as corrupt as the reſt, ought for ever to have continued ſo. Let every ſincere Chriſtian think with himſelf, what bleſſed Reaſoning This is. In Anſwer to which, We, in the Main, and with due Alterations according to the particular Circumſtances, apply to Ourſelves as compar'd with the *Romaniſts*, Thoſe Words of St. *Peter* (the pretended Founder of the Papal Authority) concerning Chriſtians as compar'd with Heathens. * *For the time paſt of our Life may ſuffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles; when we walk'd in laſciviouſneſs, luſts, exceſs of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries.* And by the Grace of God we will continue to be what They unreaſonably condemn; tho' They continue to † *ſpeak evil of us, and think it* STRANGE *that we run not with them to the ſame exceſs of riot.*

---

* 1 Pet. 4. 3. † v. 4.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

P. 27. l. 9. read *Atheiſt.* P. 36. l. 6. dele *Thoſe.* l. 7. dele *for inſtance.* P. 114. l. 7. read *unwritten.* P. 144. l. 4. read 150. P. 213. l. 22. read *as.* P. 241. l. 13. read *Tents.* P. 272. l. 19. for *this* read *the.* P. 365. l. 24. for *Church* read *Crown.*